DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 618 SO 011 712

AUTHOR Meyer, LeAnn
TITLE The Citizenship Education Issue: Problems and Programs. Report No. 123.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Dept. of Elementary/Secondary Education.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 62p.; Several pages may not reproduce clearly in hard copy due to small print
AVAILABLE FROM Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 ($5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *Citizenship; Citizenship Responsibility; Definitions; Educational History; Educational Policy; *Educational Problems; Educational Programs; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Policy Formation; Political Issues; *Program Development; *Research Needs; Social Influences; Technology; United States History

ABSTRACT

The document analyzes the background, issues, current status, and trends concerning citizenship education. In section I, historic and current forces which shape citizenship programs are presented. Civil education is traced from the revolutionary period to the present. Current influential forces described include global interdependence and advanced technology. Section II discusses the basic problems of defining citizenship and of determining the scope, degree, and locus of control of citizenship education. Current programs and promising directions comprise section III. Activities of state legislatures and education agencies, foundations, agencies, organizations, and program developers are discussed. Section IV discusses the trends and needs in citizenship education. It also suggests activities designed as a stimulus to generate ideas for groups who might want to take action to meet some of the current needs in citizenship education. A final section presents a bibliography and addresses of organizations and contact persons. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171618

THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION ISSUE: PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS

by LeAnn Meyer

Elementary/Secondary Education Department
Homer Elseroad, Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Education Comm. of the States

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report No. 123

Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado
Warren G. Hill, Executive Director

February 1979

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295, (303) 861-4917. For each report send $5. This price covers postage and handling. Prepayment required.

SP 011 112

Contents

OVERVIEW 1

WHERE IS IT COMING FROM?
- Historical Background 3
- Current Forces 7

WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?
- Definition of Citizenship 11
- The Scope of Citizenship Education 13
- The Degree and Locus of Control 17

WHO IS DOING WHAT?
- State Legislatures and State Education Agencies 20
- Foundations, Agencies, and Organizations 26
- Program Developers 33

WHERE IS IT GOING?
- Trends 41
- Needs 44
- Suggestions for Action 47

RESOURCES 54

Acknowledgements

Many persons contributed to this paper, most of whose names appear in the organizations list in the "Resources" section. Their congeniality in providing details is greatly appreciated. Homer Elseroad, director; Edie Petrock, assistant director; and Connie Maslow, business manager, of the Elementary/Secondary Education Department at ECS provided valuable assistance, as did Doris Ross and Chris Pipho, of the Research and Information Department, and Ferdie Klein, of the Communications Department. A special thanks is due to Todd Clark, Norm Gross, Russell Hill, and Jack Linden (Cherry Creek Schools), who served as consultants at various points; to Celeste Woodley (Boulder Valley School District) and Mary Jane Turner, who also critiqued an early draft; to Elizabeth Farquhar, Edwin Fenton, Howard Mehlinger, and Richard Remy, who critiqued a later draft; and especially to Barbara Miller (Aurora Public Schools) and Dick Hulsart (NAEP), who provided help and encouragement throughout. Responsibility for the actual content, of course, rests not with these persons, but with the author.

Overview

According to the noted educator R. Freeman Butts, "The urge to promote civic education through the schools accelerates in times of crisis or rapid social change."[1] The current time is one of rapid change as well as multiple crises — and the voices speaking out for better citizenship education have increased significantly within the past several years. National crises have been political, with scandal and consequent lack of public confidence; economic, with double hazards of inflation and unemployment; and social, with increasing stress to systems as various civil rights are acknowledged. Within and overlapping this broader framework, the public school system is facing something of its own crisis — in the form of public dissatisfaction with the perceived return on its dollars, resulting in a push for various accountability programs and even a threat of withdrawal for some sources of funding.

The citizenship education issue is related to all of these concerns, and its basis is a feeling on the part of many persons — including educators and social scientists as well as various groups and individuals within the public sector—that the current efforts in citizenship education are inadequate to meet the demands of the time. The reasons for this feeling are widely divergent, however, as are the proposed remedies.

For some of the persons voicing dissatisfaction, the solution is to bring back time-proven methods of transmitting definite factual knowledge — about our country's history and political processes, for example — and instilling attitudes of patriotism. Testing is considered a good way to insure a basic level of knowledge, and patriotic exercises and events are seen as a way to increase feelings of pride and respect for the country. They see the problem as one of permissiveness that has led not only to low academic achievement but also to lack of respect for authority.

On the other hand, some see the solution as being almost exactly opposite. They feel that while "inculcation" methods may have been suitable 100 years ago, these methods are unrealistic in today's world. Now, they argue, equally as important as factual knowledge is the ability to observe, to inquire, to think critically, to make decisions, to act — sometimes with the purpose of influencing desired change. They see the problem as a clinging to outmoded approaches in the midst of a knowledge exposion and an expansion of government authority. They see the role of citizen as much more complex than in the 19th century, calling for different types of skills and attitudes.

Still others — and some of the previous group as well — feel that the problem goes far beyond curriculum matters and involves the very governance structure of the school itself. They see the solution, at least partly, as making improvements in student (and parent) participation in the rule-making and policy-setting processes of the school. They feel that democratic principles are best learned by experiencing them in operation in the school and community environment. Merely continuing or even stepping up the teaching of abstract theories of democracy in situations where students can daily observe for themselves rigid and authoritarian

systems composing the "real" world is to invite the kind of cynicism that all agree is one symptom of the problem. Any improvement, they feel, must include attention to structures and procedures.

Because it involves basic philosophical differences and high emotional stakes, this issue has not been fully addressed in most places. Consequently, the confusion engendered has resulted in a number of independent approaches — often operating in parallel — that mostly add on to what is taught in the name of citizenship rather that clarifying the overall conceptualization of what citizenship education entails. Very few communities or schools have attempted to assess current social circumstances in order to determine what it means to be a citizen in this country at this point in time. Unless this is determined — as well as the skills and knowledge actually needed in order to play a full role as contemporary citizen — the present tendency toward partial, imbalanced, or do-nothing approaches is likely to continue. Such a situation increases the possibility that the school will be judged inadequate by the various groups that have different — and often conflicting — expectations of what educational outcomes should be. At the time when public schools were established, training for citizenship was seen as their *raison d'etre*. While this may no longer be such a dominant purpose, citizenship education is still a central issue upon which many other educational issues depend.

Because of its central influence and because of the confusion now faced by teachers in the field, there is an urgent need for educational policy makers at the state level to become well informed regarding the current and potential status of citizenship education, to make a commitment as to its importance, and to provide guidelines and resources for those at the local level. Teachers and local administrators need to be well informed in order to translate state guidelines into effective program planning. A national coordination effort and national support for state and local activities are also needed. In times of change and uncertainty, like the present, increased attention to the role and functioning of the citizen seems in order, as a way of reinforcing the democratic base upon which our government was built. Tending to the basic structure of this ongoing experiment in self rule is a priority that can be superseded only when all is going well — that is, if we have any thoughts for our own welfare, for our legacy to future generations, our obligations to the past, or our influence upon other democracies. The citizenship education movement, then, is seen as a maintenance procedure that deserves a high priority for increased interest and support.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a relatively quick but in-depth view of this complex issue. In the first section, historic and current forces shaping past and present programs in citizenship education are presented. In section two, the basic and central issues are discussed. In the next section, current programs and promising directions are described. Finally, in section four, suggestions are made for the benefit of various groups who might want to take action to meet some of the current needs in this area. The items in the bibliography can provide fuller treatments and lead to other references, for those who wish to delve deeper; and the list of organizations at the end can provide a guide for contacting persons who are deeply concerned and actively involved.

Where Is It Coming From?

Historical Background

Every society has the need to develop citizens with the ability to participate effectively within the society. In a democratic society, the involvement of citizens is especially essential, and that involvement must be facilitated and sustained throughout their lives. Efforts to meet this challenge have varied according to the issues and needs of the particular time. Four periods in the development of American citizenship education are summarized here to provide an overview.[2]

1. The Revolutionary Period, 1776-1826. In the 18th century, education was a voluntary process, with private schools for those who could afford them, religious schools affiliated with various denominations, and charity schools for the poor. By the end of the century, however, common public schools were fairly widespread in New England — as the best means of educating the future citizenry in the civic values, knowledge, and obligations required in a democratic republican society. Literacy was a primary concern in these early public schools, as was the inculcation of patriotic and moral virtues. Some — like Jefferson in his 1779 proposal for a Virginia law establishing public schools — felt that the study of history was the best preparation for judging the actions and designs of men and that this study would thus make the people truly safe depositories for a government — which could not just be trusted to the rulers. Others added the principles of republican government as essential study; but the founders of the schools — as their successors — pretty much left it up to textbook writers to determine just how the desired knowledge and values were to be instilled. Since most textbook writers were conservative and Puritan, the readers, spellers, and grammar books were thoroughly infused with didactic moral instrucion, patriotism, and Protestant devotion to duty. It was the mid-19th century before very many public schools had been founded outside New England, but the campaigns for establishing those, too, were campaigns for civic education, in keeping with the patriotic goals following the Revolution.

2. The Post Revolutionary Period, 1826-1876. The textbooks of this era proclaimed the benefits and the perfection of the United States of America — made possible by its Constitution, which was established by the will of the people. Also, textbooks stressed the middle-class virtues of hard work, honesty and integrity, the rewards of individual effort, and obedience to legitimate authority. In order that students might understand something of the true nature of their government, civic programs were developed to teach, primarily, the Constitution — the partitioning of power into three branches, the methods for electing or appointing officials, the use of the courts for redressing wrongs, and the duty of changing laws and rulers by ballot, not by rebellion.

Liberty was the prime political benefit for which children should love their country, but it was promoted in terms of feeling rather than by definition or analytical knowledge. The political strife emerging from the immigration of Irish and Germans of Roman Catholic faith and from changes in urban life brought about by the industrial factory system was kept safely out of the schools. Horace Mann, particularly, was fearful that any attention to partisan political matters would be seen as indoctrination and would cause parents to withdraw their children. If this happened, they would no doubt resist appropriations to support the school, and the concept of the public school would be destroyed. The solution was to teach the common elements agreed to by all, but to skip over the controversial. As reported by Ruth Miller Elson,

> The 19th-century child was taught to worship past achievements of America and to believe in the inevitable spread of the American system throughout the world. But contemporary problems are conspicuously absent, and reform movements which would have profound social or political effects are either ignored or derided. While Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy agitated the adult world, the child was taught the necessity of class distinctions.[3]

As the Civil War approached, textbooks — made in the North — began to warn of the evils of slavery; but these pages were pinned shut in the South, with teachers, instead, expanding upon the Southern heroes. The children of the underclasses did not have ready access to the developing public schools, and the children of freed blacks were also ignored or else shuttled into separate schools. As stated by R. Freeman Butts, "these evident failures of the educational system itself to put into practice the stated values of the political community helped to widen the gap between ideal and reality."[4]

3. The Civics of Progressive Modernization, 1876-1926. As millions upon millions of immigrants continued to pour into the country, an even greater amount of emphasis was placed on outward signs of loyalty, reflected in the schools by salutes to the flag, pledges of allegiance, loyalty oaths, patriotic songs and marching, and required instruction in English (as well as attacks on the teaching of foreign languages). At the same time America was becoming a world power, sure of its "manifest destiny" and set upon making the world "safe for democracy." It was exhalted as a superior nation, deserving of a loyalty to "my country, right or wrong." At home, the production capacity was greatly surpassing that of other nations, and this was attributed to self-reliant individuals "pioneering" in the industrial system — all possible under auspices of a free enterprise system operating without government controls.

Education was seen as the prime means for getting ahead; compulsory attendance laws were passed in the hopes of eliminating child labor and achieving good assimilation of immigrants; and enrollments mushroomed. In 1893 the Committee of Ten of the National Education Association (NEA) concluded that high school courses should provide a strong academic discipline — for the non-college bound as well as for those preparing for college. This resulted in the introduction of more rigorous scholarship into history courses, and a general academic orientation that dominated curriculum thinking in civic education for the next several decades.

Most influential during this era, and since, was the "social studies" movement, sponsored by the NEA's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. *The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, published by this commission in 1918, proclaimed "good citizenship" as the aim of the social studies in the high school. The term "social studies" was used to include not only history, civics, and government but also concepts from sociology and economics; and stress was given to reducing the political concerns of civic education in favor of social and economic and practical ("relevant") personal problems. Also, the door was opened to the idea that participation skills should become part of the objectives for civic education. During this time, the cycle of social studies became firmly established: communities in the 3rd and 4th grades; civics in the 9th and 12th grades; American history in the 5th, 8th, and 11th grades; with geography, state history, and European or world history coming probably in the 7th and 10th grades. Citizenship education came to be seen as a special province of the social studies curriculum.

4. Recurring Calls for Reform of Civic Education, 1926-1976. Conservative influences upon citizenship education increased after World War I; but by the 1930s the depression, the New Deal, and the rise of totalitarianism in the world led to a social reformist outlook. Numerous proposals and projects for creating more effective citizenship education programs poured forth — coming from such educators as John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick, John Childs, and George S. Counts. *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy* was produced in 1938 by the Educational Policies Commission, sponsored jointly by the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators. The following far-seeing objectives were listed for training in "civic responsibility":

Social Justice. The educated citizen is sensitive to the disparities of human circumstances.

Social Activity. The educated citizen acts to correct unsatisfactory conditions.

Social Understanding. The educated citizen seeks to understand social structures and social processes.

Critical Judgment. The educated citizen has defenses against propaganda.

Tolerance. The educated citizen respects honest differences of opinion.

Conservation. The educated citizen has a regard for the nation's resources.

Social Applications of Science. The educated citizen measures scientific advance by its contribution to the general welfare.

World Citizenship. The educated citizen is a cooperating member of the world community.

Law Observance. The educated citizen respects the law.

Economic Literacy. The educated citizen is economically literate.

Political Citizenship. The educated citizen accepts his civic duties.

Devotion to Democracy. The educated citizen acts upon an unswerving loyalty to democratic ideals.[5]

World War II broke into this movement, however, and after the war the central task of citizenship education came to be seen as that of preparing young people to cope with the political and economic threat of Communism. As a sort of defense against the perils of McCarthyism, the schools — and social studies departments in particular — once again placed strong emphasis on loyalty, the values of democracy and the free enterprise system, and the need to support one's county.

In 1953, as the McCarthy phase began to wane, the Commission on Educating for Citizenship, of the American Association of School Administrators, proposed a broad concept of citizenship education that would include "all the mutually helpful social relationships with others which democracy assumes should be characteristic of human life and living." What often happened in the fifties, however, was that programs drifted off to "problems of democratic living" including behavior and psychology of adolescents; marriage and family problems; vocational interests; and personal values — becoming so broad and so social that basic political questions of power, influence, and decision making were sometimes left out.

One notable project of the 1950s was the Citizenship Education Project at Columbia University — which stressed "laboratory practices," by which teachers and students could engage in action-oriented problem solving in the schools and in the community. Workshops and training programs were conducted for hundreds of schools and thousands of teachers — leading to such projects as studying the local congressional district to see if it provided fair representation of minority groups, making a tax map of the community to see if tax assessments were equitable, getting young people to join political clubs, etc. Funds ran out, however, and the project was abandoned — just prior to the rise of political activism of the 1960s.

During the 1960s — a period of alienation, assassination, student protest, and war — formal citizenship education was seen by many as irrelevant and superficial, while informal opportunities for social activism proliferated. Some, including the director of the American Political Science Association, downplayed citizenship education as a proper goal of the school curriculum — on the basis that citizens are formed by the *total* socialization; that democracy, like any big government, rests on specialized knowledge beyond the range of the average person; and that political science is an academic discipline, not a set of maximums on citizenship. Thus, along with the new science and the new math came the new social studies, which took on the pattern of the social science disciplines: cognitive and conceptual analysis, "inquiry learning," and the "discovery method." This emphasis and the trend toward informal activism was an attempt to blend the academic pressures for a scientific approach and the militant student demands for relevance. Some current critics feel that the attempt was an inevitable failure — and is to be blamed for many of the present problems. Others feel that many of its effects are positive and are just beginning to be realized.

Current Forces

One impetus for the current movement to re-think citizenship education is the significant changes that have occurred in our society, which some feel have rendered former approaches obsolete. One such change is the current emphasis on pluralism. Traditionally, civic education promoted a single set of traits as being "American," but the civil rights movement has come along and challenged this "melting pot" concept. The blacks — unassimilated and unequally treated — began to stress ethnic pride and the uniqueness of the black experience. Other groups soon followed this lead, and "ethnic studies" was introduced as a part of civic education. Some persons feel the change in attitude to be so pervasive that programs continuing to assume allegience to a dogmatic Americanism will not retain any significant amount of credibility.

Another change is in the position of the United States relative to other countries of the world. For some time the United States was unmatched in physical resources and political power. This is no longer true. All countries are globally interdependent to an extent not true 15 or 20 years ago. Many feel, like Howard Mehlinger, that

> Civic education has traditionally been concerned with promoting nationalism. While nation-states will not suddenly disappear or lose their influence, nevertheless students must increasingly find *identification* with the species as a whole and not with American citizens only, be *loyal* to the planet as well as to the fifty states, and be *committed* to policies and goals intended to ensure the survival of the species rather than merely increasing American power and prestige . . .[6]

A third significant change in our society is the shift in attitude regarding institutions, particularly government institutions. One example is seen in the decline in political party identification. According to the Gallup polls, there has been a steady growth since 1937 in the percentage of voters who identify themselves as "independent." In 1975, for example, 35% classified themselves as independent, 21% as Republican, and 44% as Democrat. Also, there is an increasing number of Americans who are investing energies in smaller organizations that focus on a single issue and/or are committed to specific solutions, like Common Cause or the ERA campaign. Again in the words of Mehlinger,

> Clearly, civics instruction that emphasizes governmental institutions to the exclusion of other political processes lacks contact with reality. It seems shortsighted to emphasize traditional forms of political participation — voting in elections and writing letters to members of congress — while avoiding other kinds of participation. The kinds of knowledge, skills, and attitudes citizens require to be active participants in small or large political groups are probably quite different from those needed to play the role of passive observer of governmental activities."[7]

Finally, in addition to other developments of advanced technology, one product — television — has brought changes whose significance is just beginning to be realized. For example, Tony Schwartz, a producer of television political commercials, argues that television is changing the actual processes by which human beings think.[8] Certain findings in brain research support this view. Prior to television, people were primarily left-brain dominant, relying heavily on sequential, analytic tasks based on the use of propositional thought — with its subject-predicate or cause-effect

types of relationships. Television, however, has increased development of the right hemisphere, which appears to be biased toward appositional thought — unleashed from constraints of sentence and syntax and based on such perceptions as likeness, metaphor, overall design. What this means in terms of citizenship has not yet been determined; but other effects of television *have* been documented. For example, the "bad-news-is-more-interesting" approach and the "spot" nature of most news stories and political statements give the cumulative impression that the world is filled with insoluble dilemmas; the one-way flow of information tends to increase passivity and disaffection; the high rate of sensational and violent scenes has been correlated to increases in aggressive behavior; and, finally, memory seems low for non-sensational programs: of 232 viewers interviewed immediately after a network news program, 51% could not recall a single story, and only 6 viewers recalled any of the commentary. Many feel that the role of television must be taken into account in citizenship education even though this is, at present, a frontier area requiring much more experimentation and research.

Another major impetus for the movement to reform citizenship education is concern felt by many over the general disaffection of both students and adults from the political process, exemplified in part by the number of persons who see "no point" in voting. At the March 1976 conference sponsored by the National Council for the Social Studies, the following statistics from pollsters were noted:

> By a margin of two to one, Americans believe that most politicans "don't really care about me." (Cambridge Survey Research)
>
> Fifty-eight percent believe that "people with power are out to take advantage of me." (Louis Harris Survey)
>
> Forty-nine percent believe that "quite a few of the people running the government are a little crooked." (Market Opinion Research, Inc.)
>
> Sixty-eight percent feel that "over the last ten years this country's leaders have consistently lied to the American people." (Cambridge Survey Research.)[9]

Similar concerns were also expressed at the September 1976 Kansas City conference sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers — where B. Frank Brown, from /I/D/E/A, stated that "recent polls" measured the extent of alienation at 61% of the population. Disillusionment associated with the Vietnam War and Watergate was seen as a major cause for such attitudes, but other causes were also perceived: 1) the relentless growth of government; 2) the lack of convincing approaches to such problems as unemployment, inflation, crime, pollution, energy; 3) the revelation of violations of individuals' rights and privacy by the CIA and FBI; 4) arbitrary powers exercised by bureaucrats over the private sector; 5) illegal business transactions by multinational corporations; 6) an impression that bureaucrats and elected representatives do not comprehend the changing values and aspirations that have overtaken the country; and 7) a feeling that people are unable to influence the things that are happening to them.[10]

A related concern is over the amount of personal alienation from

community and society, particularly on the part of many young people. Cited as evidence at the Kansas City conference were the extent of juvenile crime and violence, the willingness — even eagerness — to accept distorted and sensational messages from the media, and the increasing disrespect felt and expressed by young people for the most important institutions of their society. Data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress were quoted at both meetings to indicate that attitudes of disrespect are not based on knowledge — which would be embarrassing but encouraging — but are based on "abysmal ignorance."[11] Even though such absolute interpretation of the NAEP data is questionable — especially in light of the caveats offered by the NAEP staff — it has been the prevalent interpretation and has served, for many persons, to relate the problems of alienation and disrespect to ignorance, and thus to increase the focus of attention upon the schools. Although other social factors are acknowledged, much blame is placed on the evident low quality of the typical civic education programs. There is much general public concern that — as worded by Geraldine Bagby of the Danforth Foundation — "the glue that is holding our society together is becoming very weak."[12] This concern — coupled with the general conviction that schools are the agents responsible for training young people — has been a significant force leading to the current movement.

A third impetus in the reform movement is dissatisfaction with what is termed the "neglect" of citizenship education. Originally, in the public school concept, citizenship education was the primary focus of all education; by the mid-19th century, it had become identified with the social studies — particularly the civics class — and thus was treated more and more as a special area of study, or a "course," rather than a total school purpose. Then after Sputnik came a high emphasis on scientific methods, with resultant reduction of interest in the socialization processes. Even some social scientists felt that "citizenship" was not an intellectually worthy goal of education. During the same period, the trend toward electives as well as a general broadening of the curriculum introduced many competing subjects and courses. Thus, from being an overall priority concern, citizenship education was gradually relegated to a single discipline — a few courses; and then those courses were submerged in the proliferation of interests and concerns taken on by the school. B. Frank Brown feels that the shift in curricular emphasis was caused primarily by one-at-a-time responses on the part of legislators, school boards, and administrators to specific pressure groups — and corresponding additions to the curriculum.[13] The accumulation of these additions has resulted in what might be called a "curriculum crisis," which Willis Harman — writing for *Phi Delta Kappan* — has explained in this way:

> In part this crisis results from the expansionist tendency of any institutional bureaucracy; and in part derives from the fact that the public casually assigns to the schools the social functions it no longer wishes to undertake. But within the school it is often not clear how to embody these new functions in a teachable curriculum, and each new function takes its toll in time and money. The underlying problem seems to be that there is not consensus about the legitimate functions of school, and therefore no agreement about which of many competing interests have the authority to make any choices.[14]

This type of overload can be seen within the social studies area itself.

Economics, sociology, psychology, career awareness/development, social problems, ethnic studies, values clarification, consumer education, moral development, global consciousness, environmental and energy education, logic and critical thinking, law and justice, and free enterprise have all been promoted as important — and consequently vie with each other for a space in the curriculum, as well as competing with the more traditional communities, geography, history, and government. One result of this proliferation is that citizenship education has taken on an interest-group approach. Those who perceive some particular weakness in students' acquired knowledge or skills often come up with programs, approaches, and materials to remedy that weakness; and they promote them in various ways. Obviously, while there may be room for some there is not room for all; consequently, such groups often spend considerable money and great amounts of intellectual talent, as well as psychological and physical energy, to convince publishers, legislators, administrators, teachers, and others of the validity of their particular area of interest. The consequences of such a trend are described by Richard Remy:

> Decisions on such matters are made as often in response to political and monetary pressures as in response to societal or student needs . . . . The students' education meanwhile, becomes increasingly fragmented and often bears little relationship to the actual tasks and responsibilities of citizenship.[15]

Some of the major forces of influence, then, are a desire to re-prioritize — to a certain degree — educational endeavors; a concern over various social "symptoms"; and awareness of major and significant social changes. These are forces that sent a group of concerned persons to the office of David Mathews, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for a lengthy discussion early in 1975. Although citizenship education has received continuous attention by some groups, this action in 1975 marks — essentially — the beginning of the current movement for a comprehensive reform of citizenship education.

What are the Issues?

Definition of Citizenship

A primary characteristic of the current citizenship education movement is fragmentation — and even the development of opposing groups. One of the contributing factors is lack of consensus regarding the definition of citizenship — and also regarding the related matter of a suitable scope for citizenship education, which will be discussed later. It has become increasingly obvious that "citizenship" has a slightly different meaning for every person who uses it. For some it pretty much equates with "patriotism" — and the qualities called for are loyalty, obedience to authority, productivity, national pride. Some see it more or less as conformity — a blending-in to what is considered "American." Some, more specifically, see a good citizen as a defender of the republic against Communism — or as a staunch believer in "freedom" who is willing to fight anywhere in the world to promote it. Some equate citizenship with the ability to name senators, quote specific amendments to the constitution, give significant dates in our country's history, etc. For others, it has a Good Scout image — calling for persons who are "trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent." On the other hand, some see a good citizen as a social critic and/or reformer, who has skills in critical thinking, analysis, persuasion. Some see the citizen as a responsible and alert guard against a drift toward governmental dominance of individuals — or federal dominance of state activities. Some see the citizen as a volunteer activist, totally involved in specific problems or issues of the day. Then again, the term citizenship, for some, means simply being a member of the society — either by birth or by naturalization.

Besides the actual variation of meanings in themselves, there has been little realization that these differences exist, and many persons assume that "citizenship" means to others what it means to them. It was soon discovered in citizenship education conferences that persons were talking on different "wave lengths," and gradually it came to be realized that much attention must be given to — not so much the creation of a single, ultimate definition — as to a sorting out of meanings and the implications of definition. One discussion at the 1976 Indianapolis conference was summarized as follows:

> Citizenship, whatever it means now, means something different than it meant in 1950 and certainly in 1934 when we were working with a conceptual model of citizenship that was essentially a national model . . . . We need to understand what it is we're talking about.[16]

Partly, the differences of definition stem from the contentions of conservatism vs. liberalism, but also, they stem from the fact that citizenship is complex in nature, involving continuous cognitive, moral, social, and emotional growth. Four major aspects of importance for citizenship education are often cited: 1) knowledge, 2) skills, 3)attitudes

and 4) experiences.[17] *Knowledge* might involve an awareness of basic premises of a democratic society, an understanding of formal and informal political processes, some insight into how these have operated in the past, and cognizance of contemporary problems and issues and their implication. *Skills* might involve inquiry and intellectual skills — such as the ability to acquire reliable information and to reason reflectively, as well as advocacy and participation skills — such as the ability to lead meetings, participate as a discussant, organize and articulate issues, participate in campaigns, etc. *Attitudes* might involve a basic indentification with the nation, its system of government, and its beliefs — i.e. freedom and other valued precepts — but it also might involve a sense of personal identity and self worth that enhances the individual's capacity to become a productive and cooperative member of society. *Experiences* might involve opportunity to practice skills and try out understandings of concepts in role-playing or practical situations, as well as the individual's own informal contact with authority figures, institutions, etc. Considering these four aspects, it can be seen that the common conceptions of citizenship have often focused on one or two, or even only on a specific part of one aspect.

Another factor influencing definition is the overall view of citizenship. For some, citizenship implies the individual's relation to the state — and his/her interaction with government processes and institutions. For others, citizenship implies the individual's interactions with the total social and physical environment — and his/her relationships within a number of social groups. In the latter view, citizenship begins at the time the individual first enters into socialized situations; in the former view, it begins at adulthood — at the voting age, entrance into military service, marriage, eligibility for welfare, etc. Needless to say a citizenship education program based upon one of these views would be quite different from a program built upon the other view.

Another problem in defining citizenship is that it gets into a basic paradox of democracy: true freedom for citizens is a challenge to the established state — and yet for the state to remain as it now stands, it must give itself over freely to be changed.[18] For example, if citizens exercise independent judgment rather than passive obedience, as in a totalitarian state, their conclusions may run counter to established policy — and to norms considered acceptable by other citizens. The Vietnam War is a case in point. A total lack of loyalty to the state and what it stands for would inevitably mean an end to that state and to the very freedom it offers — and yet, on the other hand, a complete and unthinking allegience to the state and all of its policies would just as surely result in a gradual waning of government "by and for the people." A related tension exists within efforts to conceptualize citizenship education, particularly regarding the teaching of acceptable and effective political participation.

Our society is highly pluralistic — in many ways other than ethnically — and consequently there are many views about being a citizen. Also, circumstances of the present call for different views of citizenship than were workable in the past — or may be workable in the future. Thus, the strata of definition can be seen as vertical (in regard to time) as well as horizontal (in regard to differences between groups at any one time). If any true and meaningful reform is to occur in citizenship education, the full

issue of definition must be addressed by any group attempting to improve instruction in this area. This becomes especially important in light of the fact that some legislatures are now mandating instruction in "citizenship" — with no generally available guidelines for determining the nature of that instruction. Few communities have worked through this problem and know what citizenship means to their various members. Consequently, most schools are not in a position to respond to such mandates in any but the most superficial way.

The Scope of Citizenship Education

In addition to the problem of resolving what "citizenship" means in late 20th century America, there is a related problem of determining the educational experiences that can best promote citizenship development. This issue has at least three dimensions: 1) the school as the agent for citizenship education vs. the total learning environment, 2) citizenship education as social studies curriculum vs. a set of goals serving as a filter for the total school operation, and 3) the content and type of instruction that come under the "citizenship education" umbrella.

Generally, when people think of training young people for citizenship, they think in terms of what the schools teach — or negatively, if they see a lack of social responsibilty, they think the schools have not been doing a very good job of teaching citizenship. It is easy to overlook or forget the many other sources of learning that contribute to citizenship development. Other agents in the process include the family; community leaders; peer groups; governmental institutions and agencies — local, state, and federal; other social agencies; religious institutions; voluntary organizations; the work place; the market place; the mass media. Ralph W. Tyler warns that especially in the case of citizenship education, we must not confuse education with schooling:

> An educational *system*, of which school is only a part, furnishes the experiences through which a young person learns to participate constructively in a modern industrialized society. What he or she experiences in the home, in social activities in the community, in chores and jobs, in religious institutions, in reading, in listening to radio and viewing television, and in the school are all part of the educational system through which he or she acquires knowledge and ideas, skills and habits, attitudes and interest, and basic values.
>
> • • •
>
> In the recent period of rapid social change, the educational roles of the home, the community, the religious institutions, and employment have been greatly changed. Generally, they have been reduced. Only the school is maintaining approximately the same role with the same amount of time annually for its work with children and youth. The time no longer occupied by the other experiences has largely been taken up by television. Schram and Parker report that the average American child between the ages of ten and fourteen spends about 1,500 hours per year viewing television and only about 1,100 hours per year in school.
>
> • • •
>
> The contemporary effort to improve education and to give more explicit attention to citizenship and character development can be a positive influence if it is based on a more realistic understanding of the total educational system.[19]

Ralph Tyler and Richard Remy both suggest that some sectors of society may be more appropriate than others for providing certain experiences related to citizenship development or for teaching certain knowledge, attitudes, or skills. For example, families and peer groups can be strong forces in shaping basic identities, values, and skills. The mass media may be an important source of information and opinions about current situations and events. Organizations may be an appropriate source for experiencing group decision making. On the other hand, some sectors may be more accessible for direct intervention than others. The sheer number of families, for example, would present a tremendous communication task.[20] These ideas — plus the fact that citizenship development continues throughout a person's life — are important considerations in any efforts to determine the desired shape of citizenship education programs. Without such deliberate consideration, the possibilities for coordination of effort are likely to be overlooked. In the absence of coordination — or at the very least an awareness of what each sector is contributing to citizenship development — it is entirely possible that the "message" being received by young people from one source can be cancelling out or garbling the "message" being received from another. A point at issue, then, is the extent to which efforts for citizenship education reform — if they are to be effective — can be focused on the schools alone, and to what extent they must be broadened to take into consideration other parts of society as well.

Although schools are not the only agents influencing citizenship development, they are, nonetheless, equipped to and do perform a strong role. Schools are information rich environments and have the tools needed to help understanding. They offer a protected environment for controlled instruction, allowing practice and experimentation — with continuity over a period of time. They provide a large number of adults with which the child can interrelate. They have a structure within which election, decision making, authority, rule enforcement, interpersonal influence, community interaction, and other processes of democracy are operational.[21] The very range of possibilities brings forth a point of issue very similar to that above.

Not only do people usually think of schools when they think of citizenship education, but also they think of courses of instruction — civics, history, government, economics, social problems, law-related, etc. At the same time, the "hidden cirriculum" has an effect on citizenship development that often goes unrecognized. The "hidden curriculum" includes the power structure of the school system, the policies by which the school operates, the attitudes and methods of teachers and administrators, membership in extra-curricular activities, etc. If there are processes by which the educational concerns of a particular group — or even family — can be ameliorated; if citizens, teachers, and students are involved in policy decisions; if learning experiences can provide a reasonable amount of success for all students; if activities invite and encourage participation by any person in the school; if there is active interaction between school and community — then a student will develop different attitudes and interrelational skills than if none of these circumstances prevail in the school.

If citizenship education is to be taken seriously, then total school influences must be considered. Adding a new course to the existing

curriculum is probably the least effective way of addressing the problems of concern within the current movement. Even a major curriculum reorganization is inadequate in itself — because citizenship development occurs outside the classroom as much as within. What a student experiences throughout the schooling process and what is taught in the classroom should coincide and reinforce each other if there are to be positive results. If not, students are quick to perceive the hypocrisy; the outside experiences are taken as representative of the "real" world; and respect for and attention to the classroom instruction are diminished. An effective citizenship education "program" might best be a set of goals that pervade the total school system and its relationship to the community. These goals would include but would not be limited to curriculum development.

A third problem regarding the scope of citizenship education is its amorphous nature. It is an area of indefinite shape or boundaries, and can be stretched to encompass almost any experience. Some persons, particularly in the 1960s and early 1970s, have used this point to argue against curricular approaches to citizenship:

> Anything anybody wants to teach can be defended as necessary for "good citizenship." James Bryant Conant once insisted that literature should be taught because it promoted citizenship; the Modern Language Association argues that in this age of jet transport foreign languages are needed for citizenship; scientists say that we need citizens informed of the capabilities and limitations of science . . . . As a practical matter "citizenship" is a hopeless goal for instruction.[22]

Most persons would take a more dualistic view: granted that citizenship education is more a set of goals for the education process than it is a curricular area as such, nonetheless an instructional program is a justifiable part of the process. The problem comes from two directions: 1) identifying citizenship education too closely and rigidly with the traditional history and government courses only, and 2) the proliferation of instruction and approaches that now compete for a place in "citizenship education." The point of issue, then, is — assuming that a citizenship education program should rightfully have an instructional component of some sort — what should be the content and the approach for that instruction?

Using Fred Newmann's list of "eight generally distinguishable approaches to civic education" and the "Seven Key Approaches to Citizenship Education" listed in the *Selected Readings* prepared for the National Conference on Education and Citizenship[23] — plus some items from other sources — yields a composite list of at least twelve substantially different areas of content and/or approach that are commonly associated with citizenship education at the present time:

1. Academic disciplines—history and political science
2. Social problems
3. Critical thinking/Decision making
4. Values clarification and skills/Concrete values
5. Ethics/Moral development
6. Community involvement/Action skills/Community education
7. Law-related education

8. Economics/Free enterprise education
9. Global perspectives education
10. Family-related education
11. Multi-ethnic education/Pluralism
12. Personal development and social skills/Prosocial behavioral training

This does not include other social studies concerns, such as the academic disciplines of sociology and psychology, career awareness/development, consumer education, and environmental and energy education — although some persons would include one or more of these items on the list also.

All of these approaches have something of value to offer and many are being very persuasively promoted by variously large and powerful support groups; but the fact remains that citizenship is only one of several goals of modern schools, and the amount of instructional time is limited. There is a point at which it is not possible — preceded, no doubt, by a point at which it is not effective—to add on another independent course or unit to the existing instruction. Choices must be made, and they should be made in reference to overall goals for citizenship and with full knowledge of possible alternatives. The ultimate choice is not to include some areas and exclude others, but to take the best insights and the essential knowledge that each has to offer and formulate a total program based on a holistic view of what citizenship entails. The instructional component should be designed so that any specific instruction is proportioned according to the type and extent of contribution it makes toward the overall goal — and in relation to community and total-school processes that may also be contributing.

One of the major problems — and points of issue — at the present time is the fragmentation that is developing within citizenship education as a result of the various independent approaches, each with its own support group. For example, groups promoting law-related education, or free enterprise, or global studies have created and introduced valuable programs and materials into many schools — but, for the most part, without any coordination process that would relate these with other instruction, all within comprehensive goals for citizenship development. The same is true of "value clarification" programs, that are not related to history, for example. Some traditionalists feel that factual knowledge is basic and that time is wasted and controversy stirred by "participatory" activities. And sometimes enthusiasts for the "developmental" theories feel that most of the present instruction is pointless or even counter-productive since the child is not being brought up to an appropriate learning stage prior to the instruction. Not only are various groups "doing their own thing" without relating it very well to what others are doing, but, in some cases, there is conflict over what others have a right to do. Although most groups are beginning to broaden their programs out from the central core of interest, there has been, so far, little objective effort to meld the best of several approaches into a more comprehensive and coordinated instructional package. Schools, for the most part, are adopting one or more of the independent programs. On the other hand, some schools have ignored recent developments altogether and are maintaining a program

essentially the same as that being implemented 10 or more years ago. The resulting effect, all too often, is a divided or incomplete program that is lower in quality than it could be if more alternatives were taken into consideration within an overall planning process.

Thus, the issue of scope involves what and how much is to be included, in what ways, in the curriculum; how and to what extent the curricular efforts are to be related to the structures and procedures of the total school; and finally, how and to what extent the efforts of the school are to be coordinated with other influencing agents within the lives of students. These are some of the decisions that need to be made if improvement in citizenship education is genuinely desired. The related problem — who should be making what decisions — is discussed as the third major issue and labeled *control.*

The Degree and Locus of Control

Probably no other identifiable learning area that the schools attempt to teach is more sensitive in regard to control than is citizenship education. Although families, communities, and now television each play a large role in shaping the attitudes and thought patterns of children, nevertheless education is a very strong force; and children are highly vulnerable to indoctrination — as proven in many parts of the world. The very nature of a democracy makes it imperative that the people — communities — have charge of schools rather than government officials at the federal, or even the state level. Thus, few persons would question that the appropriate level for making curriculum decisions is the local level — particularly regarding the teaching of knowledge, skills, and attitudes about political/civil matters. There are some problems with this, however.

First of all, state and federal governments *are* involved in education — not only in financial matters but also in establishing programs and curriculum standards. In most cases this intervention is justifiable and helpful. For example, local education agencies need not only financial assistance, but also they need assistance with the continuous burden of curriculum development. Guidelines and information coming from the state can result in better curricula — and in less local isolation. In a complex and highly mobile world, some source of standards beyond the local level helps to assure at least a basic consistency. Problems can arise, however, when mandates are handed down, particularly if those mandates have been hastily drawn up and are not based on a broad awareness of the problems involved. When local districts must scramble to comply with short-term mandates or must create new programs without adequate guidelines, instruction is almost sure to suffer. Another problem involves mandates that are passed as a result of lobbies or pressure groups. Some groups within the area of citizenship education have been able to develop exceptional organization and/or have exceptional access to legislators. To many persons outside those groups, it seems frighteningly possible that citizenship education in this country could be dominated by those achieving such power.

A point at issue, then, is the level at which various decisions regarding citizenship education are best made, and a related point is the extent of representation behind any mandate or major policy decision, at whatever

level. Extensive cooperative thinking as well as a focused attention are needed in order to determine the most acceptable chain of authority. Such questions as the following should be addressed, perhaps by an alliance or national group: what populations *should* be involved in decision making for citizenship education; how is input to be assured; do mandates help or hinder; how broad or specific should mandates be if they are needed? Some feel that the views of trained educators should predominate in educational decisions. Some feel that the values of the local community must be a prime consideration. On the other hand, education — and particularly citizenship education — is clearly related to the preservation of the society, and decisions have far wider significance than the technicalities of educational delivery systems or purely local needs.

The issue of *level* of decision making has two components: 1) the level at which actual decisions are to be made, and 2) the level at which the criteria for decision making are to be determined. The general responsibility for establishing criteria falls at the state level, but in some aspects — particularly relative to the preservation of society — criteria for decision making regarding citizenship education could be national. In other aspects, the criteria might even be determined beyond the national level — such as those relative to human rights and the just means for obtaining those rights. The important thing is that levels of authority be clear and representative of appropriate populations. A national goal, for example, could be that educational decision making be based on the criterion of equal access to the public schools — not only in terms of attendance but also in terms of participating in curriculum decisions. The state, then, might create a more specific set of criteria to guide local decision making, incorporating this national concept along with others — such as minimum curriculum for the state. In the process, a participatory mechanism would be employed so that all concerned have a voice (i.e. equal access) in determining the specific state criteria. A similar participatory process would then serve as the basis for decision making, at the local level, regarding the particular program that is planned and the broad means for its implementation. Individual schools, in turn, might have the authority to interpret the program and select materials, and would employ an appropriate participatory model in arriving at those decisions. The individual teacher might have discretionary latitude for the particular teaching strategies to be used, as well as having proportional input into program decisions. Even at this level, however, there might be an established procedure for dealing with parent or other protest — not only to insure that the values of all persons are respected, but also to protect individual principals and teachers from intimidating harrassment. However it is conceived, some type of process for establishing areas of legitimate authority is important in an area such as citizenship education — where values, moral development, political issues, and other controversial matters have an appropriate place in the learning process. The alternatives to such a structure seem to be unproductive conflict or a return to the bland and thus rather ineffective civic education programs of the past.

The issue of representation could also be divided into two sub-issues. Most people would agree that there is a body of knowledge — i.e. an instructional component — attached to "citizenship education." On the

other hand, this instructional component is only one part of the total picture. Thus it might be said that citizenship education is both formal and informal. The question, then, is — should decisions regarding the formal component of citizenship education be made by different groups than those regarding the informal, or non-curricular, component? For example, one model might call for a mixed group — i.e. representatives from business, labor, law, religion, social agencies, various minority groups, etc. as well as from education — serving as a panel or task force to 1) determine the appropriate citizenship education program for the total community, 2) delegate the specific development of various parts of the program, and 3) provide guidelines and coordination for participating agencies. The instructional component, then, might be designed or chosen primarily by educators, but within the guidelines for the overall community program and in cooperation with other aspects of the program. To connect with the model given earlier, the community task force might design its overall program in keeping with state and/or federal criteria for decision making. The key factor in regard to representation is that at every level there be an established and orderly process for insuring equal opportunity to influence criteria as well as actual decision making.

The matter of degree and locus of control to be exerted over any particular school's approach to citizenship education is a key issue, but a sensitive one. Its resolution goes beyond the province of any one community or perhaps any one state. An unusual amount of imagination, articulation, tolerance, and cooperation from a wide range of people will be necessary to come up with fully satisfactory answers to two central questions: 1)what persons, at what levels, have the right/ability/obligation to determine the nature of citizenship education? 2) What mechanism for decision making can assure that at least the following are taken into active consideration: a) public opinion, including what parents want for their children; b) the needs of society, including essentials for the preservation of the society; c) the advice of professional educators — particularly, in the case of citizenship education, the social and political scientists; and d) the advice of practitioners in all related service areas — i.e. politicians, lawyers, businessmen, clergy, social workers, government officials, etc.

Thus, in summary of the issues, it seems that time and change have necessitated that the challenge for definition of "citizenship" once again be met; we must refocus the picture to see what it is we are aiming to achieve. Also, the growing insights and increased social sensitivities of our time have resulted in a proliferation of promising possibilities, requiring decisions about the scope or range of citizenship education programs. Finally, the pressures for making choices bring up the overriding matter of control, which requires cooperative thinking about the appropriate levels and persons for addressing these other problems.

Who Is Doing What?

State Legislatures and State Education Agencies

For many years, virtually every state in the union has had legislation mandating instruction in the Constitution of the United States, U.S. history, and/or government/civics — usually at the elementary as well as secondary level.[24] Generally, the mandates specify the subject areas but leave the content and emphasis of instruction to professional educators in state departments and local districts. In some states, there are also laws requiring "patriotic" activities.[25] On the other hand, some states have prohibited certain "indoctrination" — like Communism or racism, for example. These are the most common — and usually long-standing — legislative approaches to citizenship training in the schools; but new activity is occurring within this area.

Since 1973, about one-half of the states have passed legislation related to citizenship education. As before, the most common type of action is to require instruction, either a unit or a course, in an area either narrowly or broadly defined. The subject showing up most frequently at the present time, however, is "free enterprise," either alone or in conjunction with requirements in "government," "Americanism," "civics," etc. Between 1973 and 1976, eight states passed "free enterprise" legislation, and three more introduced such bills in 1977.[26] Another relatively frequent item showing up in state statutes is "student participation." Programs range from Alabama's ruling that a student must serve on the Board of Regents — to Texas' official adoption of the Close-Up Program — to Oregon's rather elaborate GRASP program (Government Responsibility and Student Participation), which sets up an advisory council to work with school districts, providing hands-on experiences for students in government and community activity as well as increasing teachers' knowledge of state and local government. Pennsylvania, Florida, and Oregon are studying the possibilities of similar legislation.

Another recent legislative trend is to require "minimum competency." Of the thirty-six states that have initiated programs to set up basic skills testing, ten have included citizenship as one of the areas in which competency should be demonstrated. These are California, Georgia, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming.[27] At least one other — Maryland — is studying the relationship of citizenship to minimum competency programs. Some states have state board stipulations for basic areas of study, rather than legislation. Pennsylvania, which is one of those states, includes citizenship as the fourth priority — behind reading, writing, and mathematics.

Several studies and surveys of citizenship programs have been made in the past several years, either on the national, regional, or state level. A national survey of state education agencies was conducted in 1977 by Mark Blum, of the University of Louisville, in cooperation with Research for Better Schools.[28] By means of an initial telephone interview, a follow-up questionnaire, and examination of state guidelines — and with 46 states

participating in the study — it was determined that 31 states have begun major revisions in citizenship education programs since 1970, and more states are considering them.[29] Fifteen broad areas of policy focus were identified. These are listed below, preceeded by the number of states that affirm each:

46— plan to integrate the concrete values and principles identified with the history of democratic institutions in the United States into any new efforts.

43— seek to develop citizenship education curricula which develop in students the skills necessary for lifelong competency in society.

42— seek to integrate values education with citizenship-education curricula in order to provide students with values that guide citizenship practice.

40— have developed or are developing guidelines for ethical/moral/values education which draw upon recent developments in the social sciences.

38— feel that citizenship education should be carried out within existing academic disciplines, such as social sciences, language arts, and health sciences. They believe that efforts in curriculum development and teacher-training should be conducted under the leadership of educators within these disciplines.

37— explicitly recognize the existence of pluralistic and multi-ethnic concerns in the design of any statewide plan.

36— feel that the state education agency should play a leadership role in providing information, guidance for program development, teacher-training support, and curriculum guidelines to local educational agencies.

34— have articulated educational goals which can direct teachers and administrators in research programs at the local school level.

27— feel that youth and adults must communicate their values, interests, and concerns to each other in order to create an intergenerational mutual ground for respect and cooperation. They seek to institute educational treatments that link school and community in common programs.

26— perceive the United States citizenry as being critically confused with regard to ethics/morals/values. They see public education as the prime vehicle to bring renewed clarity.

26— find it desirable to guide teachers in their selection of teaching strategies in order to insure effective instruction. These states see the preparation of curriculum guides and other informational documents by the state education agency as a prime means of such guidance.

26— recognize the traditional and continuing proprietary domain of the family and religion in the care of ethics/morals/values, while asserting the need for careful intervention by public education.

23— recognize that the state education agency can only recommend policies and procedures to local educational agencies and that the latter should take the initiative for the direction taken in their communities.

21— see a need for public consensus to facilitate effective development of citizenship education programs. They seek to coordinate opinion through special study commissions composed of community members.

17— feel that effective citizenship education must involve interdisciplinary cooperation within the school, and interagency cooperation among the social services within the larger community. They recognize that citizenship education, with emphasis on the practice of ethically/morally informed citizenship, requires learning opportunities and adult guidance that no one school, discipline, or community agency can provide.[30]

Nine major program directions among the states were also identified and classified in this study, as listed below. Although the categories are heavily skewed toward moral/values education — with, for example, the political and decision-making components showing up hardly at all and the global and ethnic components missing altogether — the study does give a nationwide picture of how some of the activities relevant to citizenship education are attended to in the states.[31]

Skill-Development:

1. Values Education
   a. Values skills — encourages development in forming, clarifying, applying, and identifying values in students' social roles. Teacher training is presently carried out in thirty-eight states. Leading educators include Simon, Raths, and Rokeach.
   b. Concrete values — focuses on those values which are held to be necessary to the understanding and practice of every citizen (e.g. liberty, equality). The chief method of instruction is didactic, through use of moral stories in English and social studies classes. The Los Angeles schools published an extensive curriculum guide (1966).
2. Moral Reasoning — is structured on the stages of cognitive-affective moral development; most are based on Kohlberg's work. Research and development in this area are closely followed in Minnesota, with a comprehensive document available from the Department of Education (1976).
3. Personal Development — a competency-based series of experiences focusing on various dimensions of the person, with the goal of making students responsible, self-actualizing decision makers. Such programs include classes in cognitive, affective, interpersonal, and social skills. Examples are Minnesota's Deliberate Psychological Education program, West Virginia's Family Therapy program, North Dakota's Self-enhancing program, and North Carolina's Life Skills program.
4. Prosocial Behavioral Training — applies the principles of behavior modification and usually concentrates on delinquent youth. Missouri's Character Education Program is an exemplary model.
5. Law-Related Education — includes study of the institutions of the United States' government and legal system; it also offers extensive opportunities for visitation, simulation, and practicum experiences in the processes of government. Directed mainly at the secondary school levels.

Skill-Utilization:

6. Community Education — stresses service by youth in public and private community service agencies.
7. School-Community Education — reaches into the community, under the leadership of a school district, in order to provide adult community education

which allows both youth and adults to participate in the discussion and analysis of values. Parent-led classes in schools and the use of parents as school counselors are sometimes a part of the program. Idaho, Louisiana, and Pennsylvania have exemplary programs.

8. Economic-Political Practicum Education — places students in public or private institutions so that they may exercise the skills and become informed in the practices of public life. Internship and work-study programs are examples.
9. Consumer Education — helps students develop skills for effective membership in society, knowledge and competence in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and particularly the knowledge and skills involved in being a competent consumer in the marketplace. Study of and participation in consumer-advocacy agencies are sometimes included. Kansas and North Dakota have exemplary programs.[32]

A table identifying states and giving total numbers for each approach was presented in the report and is included here as Table 1.

In the tri-state region of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, citizenship education was given top priority within a three-year "school improvement program" — with technical assistance coming from Research for Better Schools (RBS) under a grant from NIE.[33] A survey of the citizenship education interests and activities in these three states was conducted last year. Also, each state has established a state-wide Task Force — with a strong lay component — to develop guidelines for citizenship education within that state. Aside from the common factor of RBS consultation and a tri-state conference for sharing ideas, each state will work independently to plan its own program in keeping with its other programs and guidelines. New programs and materials are being planned to integrate with existing K-12 political education competencies as well as programs in law-related, consumer, and environmental education. Model programs are to be planned and implemented at selected local districts.

Some examples of other state activity include the following: Indiana has developed a comprehensive curriculum guide for social studies, based on guidelines from the National Council for the Social Studies as well as on a screening of many social studies guides across the United States. It includes techniques for teaching, as well as content; and activity examples are included for each grade level. Indiana also provides districts with consumer/economic education guidelines and a global studies package — with supplementary classroom activities. Illinois has endorsed the concept of "responsibility education," designated as "the fourth R." In this plan, citizenship — as both a *sense* of responsibility and the knowledge, skills, judgments, standards, and commitment to *act* responsibly — is seen as a thread, or focus, that should run throughout the entire education process. A handbook has been prepared by the state department of education explaining the concept and including a comprehensive list of foundations supportive of the concept.

In Arizona, citizenship education has been identified as a primary goal for 1978-1979. Because of concern over the Gallup report of public attitudes, the program will emphasize rights, responsibilities and respect. Also, the Department of Education is preparing supplementary teaching materials — for example 4×6 cards, by grade level, constituting a file of "bright ideas." At the local level, Poston Junior High at Mesa has a 3R's Club that utilizes the positive reinforcement approach to promote this theme: persons are identified as "contributors" to the 3 R's — i.e. rights,

Table 1
Major Trends in Ethical-Citizenship Education Programs*

	1a. Values skills	1b. Concrete values	2. Moral reasoning	3. Personal development	4. Prosocial education	5. Law-related education	6. Community education	7. School-community education	8. Economic-political practice	9. Consumer education
Alabama	•	•				•		•		•
Alaska	•							•		
Arizona		•				•				•
Arkansas†										
California	•	•				•		•		•
Colorado		•								
Connecticut	•		•							
Delaware†										
Florida	•	•	•		•	•				
Georgia						•				
Hawaii	•	•				•		•		•
Idaho		•						•		
Illinois	•	•				•	•	•	•	•
Indiana	•	•	•					•		
Iowa						•				•
Kansas	•	•				•				•
Kentucky	•	•						•	•	•
Louisiana	•	•			•	•	•	•		
Maine	•	•				•	•	•		
Maryland	•	•	•	•		•				•
Massachusetts	•	•	•			•		•		•
Michigan	•	•	•					•	•	
Minnesota	•	•	•	•		•		•		
Mississippi	•	•								•
Missouri	•	•			•	•				•

*From *Ethical-Citizenship Education Policies and Programs: A National Survey of State Education Agencies*, by Mark Blum (Research for Better Schools, 1977), p. 11

Table 1
(Continued)

	1a. Values skills	1b. Concrete values	2. Moral reasoning	3. Personal development	4. Prosocial education	5. Law-related education	6. Community education	7. School-community education	8. Economic-political practice	9. Consumer education
Montana		•								
Nebraska	•	•	•			•		•		
New Hampshire	•	•	•			•				
New Jersey†										
New Mexico†										
New York	•	•	•			•		•		
Nevada	•					•				•
North Carolina	•	•		•		•				•
North Dakota	•	•		•		•		•		•
Ohio	•	•						•		
Oklahoma	•	•				•		•		•
Oregon	•	•					•			•
Pennsylvania	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•
Rhode Island				•						•
South Carolina	•	•				•		•		•
South Dakota			•					•		•
Tennessee	•	•								•
Texas	•	•				•		•		
Utah	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	
Vermont	•	•	•			•				
Virginia	•	•	•			•				
Washington	•	•				•	•	•		
West Virginia	•	•		•			•	•		
Wisconsin	•	•				•				•
Wyoming	•	•		•						
TOTALS	38	39	14	8	4	30	7	25	5	21

†No response.

responsibilities, and respect. The state of Missouri has also declared citizenship education a high priority area, and the department of education is in the process of preparing a state social studies guide, the major focus of which is citizenship education. These are but a few examples of developments in various states.

Foundations, Agencies, and Organizations

Several foundations have been supportive of citizen education for a number of years, such as the Carnegie Foundation, which provided money for the development of the Citizen Education Project at Columbia University in the 1950s; the Rockefeller Foundation, which supported the Student Advisory Committee on International Affairs; the Ford Foundation, which provided funds to the Foreign Policy Association to devise teaching materials; the Mott Foundation; the Hearst Foundation; Lilly Endowment; and others. Two, however, have been highly instrumental in the current movement. Both had long been active proponents and supporters of citizenship education, but in 1975 the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and the Danforth Foundation joined forces to sponsor the National Task Force on Citizenship Education, charged with studying the status of citizenship education in the schools and making recommendations for improvement. The director chosen for the Task Force was B. Frank Brown, Director of /I/D/E/A/ Information and Services Program; and the chairman of the advisory group was R. Freeman Butts of Columbia University. The report of this task force, entitled *Education for Responsible Citizenship*, includes 21 "Recommendations for Strengthening Civic Education" as well as articles which point out the fundamental societal dilemmas that exist. Some persons feel that this report represents the kind of reconceptualization of citizenship education that is needed.[34]

The concern of the Danforth-Kettering group and its meeting with HEW Secretary Mathews energized the commitment to citizenship education of the United States Office of Education. Its commitment took several directions — first of all, the establishment in 1976 of an Office of Citizen Education, directed initially by Logan Sallada, through which activities were coordinated. One activity was the sponsorship — along with the Council of Chief State School Officers — of a large citizenship conference held in Kansas City during September 1976. Over 400 people participated, representing six segments of society: home, church, school, business, labor and government. At that meeting, four needs for improvement in citizenship education were recognized — as identified by Howard Mehlinger: 1) need to link in-school and out-of-school learning, 2) need for new conceptualizations for citizen education, 3) need to balance local and cosmopolitan values and perspectives and 4) need to cope with the effects of television on citizen behavior. Also, the group called for states to make citizen education a major priority once again, and supported the concept of an alliance or consortium of individuals, agencies, and groups who could join together explicitly for the purpose of promoting citizenship education.[35] The summary report of this conference was published by HEW under the title *Education and Citizenship*.

More recently, under the direction of Elizabeth Farquhar, the Office of

Citizen Education has produced a series of reports — as a culmination of the three-year federal effort to examine critical issues and develop information on the status and needs of citizen education. One of these reports, *An Analysis of the Role of the U.S. Office of Education and Other Selected Federal Agencies in Citizen Education,*[36] was designed to help program develpers and planners better utilize existing federal resources — since citizen education is not a priority of any federal agency and thus elements are scattered throughout many different programs and agencies. Programs are described in terms of 1) purpose and background, 2) relationship to citizen education activities, 3) eligibility and 4) examples of funded projects. Those included are USOE programs that provide direct resources and those that provide funds indirectly; activites of the Education Division of HEW; and programs in the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. The other reports — some of which provide a type of public dialogue — are described as follows:

Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency for Public Policy by Nea and Walter Toner of Seattle, Washington, suggests that citizen participation is an interactive process, involving an exchange of important information between public officials and citizens for use in planning and decisionmaking. Their paper examines citizen participation as an integral part of the decisionmaking process. It should aid public school administrators who are seeking ways to develop effective collaboration between the school and the commmunity on issues such as finance and educational policy.

New Directions in Communications Policy: Implications for Citizen Education and Participation by Larry Rothstein of Boston, Massachusetts, examines the role of the mass communications in the development of civic competence. It describes the growing public interest in increasing access to the media, broadening the diversity of media content, and encouraging responsiveness to public needs. In addition, the potential of new developments in communications technology (e.g., inter-active cable) for citizen education is discussed.

Examining the Role of the Workplace in Citizen Education examines this topic from the perspectives of labor unions and business. The first section of the paper reports on a project which brought together labor union personnel and university and trade union educators to examine ways in which labor unions contribute to citizen education. Their report describes goals of industrial democracy, the ways in which unions foster political knowledge and skills, and provides recommendations for further consideration. The second section of the paper contains a report developed by business representatives with an interest in corporate social responsibility programs; their paper discusses the stake of business in citizen education and public affairs, and includes an analysis of numerous corporate activities related to politics, economics, and public service. To provide additional insights and a range of views on issues raised by both projects, the publication includes critical comments from persons affiliated with public interest groups, quality of worklife programs, and other relevant concerns.

Key Concepts of Citizenship: Perspectives and Dilemmas by Robert Salisbury, Washington University, St. Louis, focuses on the idea and purposes of participation. The paper examines the philosophical interpretations of political participation, questions the extent to which participation promotes individual and group interests, relates participation to the policy development process, and concludes with referenee to the intrinsic values of individual participation. Five experts in citizen education research or practice provide a range of comments on Dr. Salisbury's text.

In *Citizen Education and the Future*, Willis Harman of SRI-International, Palo Alto, California, proposes that the concept of industrialization provides a key for

interpreting the major developments of our times, and also presents unique problems for the exercise of citizenship. The essay contains an exploration of likely alternative futures to help readers understand whether present barriers to citizen activity are likely to lessen or increase. Critical reviews from experts in education, political science, and other fields are incorporated within the essay, and an appendix by Clemont Bezold, Institute for Alternative Futures, discusses futuristic techniques and curriculum needs.

Finally, *Citizen Education Today: Developing Civic Competencies* by Elizabeth Farquhar and Karen Dawson provides a general look at the Citizen Education Staff project, and an analysis of the state of the field. This report is based on papers commissioned by the staff, including those listed above, as well as others prepared by Richard Remy, Ohio State University, Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick, Indiana University, Judith Torney, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Stephen McCurley, National Center for Voluntary Action, Ruth Jones, University of St. Louis, and numerous other individuals and organizations. *Citizen Education Today* examines the issues facing the field, current research and assessment data, and describes illustrative programs in various sectors of society. It concludes with a discussion of major needs facing the field.[37]

In undertaking *An Analysis of the Roles of the U.S. Office of Education and Selected Agencies*, described above, the Citizen Education staff established a framework identifying three components of citizenship education, each involving knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for effective and responsible citizenship. The three components are 1) legal rights and responsibilities, and the values and principles underlying them; 2) public issues; and 3) participation for personal development and political advocacy. A chart was developed listing common objectives in terms of this framework — and is included here as Table 2.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS is a nonprofit organization that has been working in the area of citizenship education for a number of years. Several grants have been supplied by the National Institute of Education, with the purpose of the initial year-long contract stated as "to plan national development of moral-citizenship education." Numerous conferences, symposia, and occasional papers, as well as recommendations for development of a national [illegible] citizenship education resulted from that project, directed by Russell A. Hill. One outcome of Hill's work was the preparation of a congressional bill calling for the establishment and support of a National Center for Citizenship Education — the purpose of which would be "to create and seek adoption of citizenship education programs at the local level in both school and community agencies" — and to establish grants to states to set up technical assistance groups in citizenship education. The bill was introduced in the Senate in October 1978 by Senator Randolph. As part of their own on-going commitment, RBS has initiated a five year emphasis on citizen education — focusing on research, development, and dissemination — with Barbara Presseisen as director of this component. The pattern of activity will follow, for the most part, that which is now being implemented in the tri-state area of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

In June 1977, the Sugarloaf Conference was held — for the purpose of founding the Alliance for Citizen Education, an organization called for at the Kansas City conference and promoted by RBS and others. The Institute for the Study of Civic Values sponsored this retreat, with a grant from the Edward M. Hazen Foundation. The purposes of the alliance were

Table 2
Some Representative Objectives*

Major Areas of Citizen Education	Knowledge	Skills**	Attitudes**
1. Legal Rights and Responsibilities	System of law and government Principles and values underlying them Relationship to human needs and cultural change Governance	Analysis Conflict resolution Ethical reasoning	Valuing democratic principles: freedom, equality, justice, human dignity, majority rule, and minority rights
2. Public Issues	Political/economic/ social systems and how they interrelate Issues of local, State, national, and international concern Global interdependence Public policymaking process Growth of public sector	Data-gathering (or generating) Information-processing and interpreting Problem-definition and solution Evaluating future consequences of policy alternatives	See 1 and 3.
3. Participation for personal development and to achieve specific objectives	Group processes Political and interest groups Structure and function of public institutions and their points of access Modes of participation and how they evolve	Listening, speaking Negotiating with authorities Perspective-taking Working with a group	Self-esteem, Efficacy Personal identification and belonging Responsibility and concern for the group as a whole

*From *An Analysis of the Role of the U.S. Office of Education and Other Selected Federal Agencies in Citizen Education*, by Ann Maust and Lucy Knight; HEW Publication (OE) 78-07002.

**Some attributes listed here are not the sole responsibility of either citizen education classes or even the schools. They are learned in a variety of settings, but, like basic communications skills, are vital to effective citizen education.

stated as 1) "to create opportunities for dialogue among educators working on different aspects of citizen education, whose efforts are now weak and fragmented," and 2) "to give national visibility to the growing movement to make citizenship . . . the focus of all education."[38] Directed by Edward Schwartz — of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values, which has also provided its location as headquarters — the alliance publishes a quarterly bulletin, has held a national conference, and is now organizing a series of regional conferences to provide the dialogue mentioned above.

An organization that has had a central commitment to citizenship education since its beginning in 1921 is the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). The 1951 and 1960 Yearbooks were *Education for Democratic Citizenship* and *Citizenship and a Free Society*, respectively. During 1963-1967 the national council compiled a survey of *Promising Practices in Civic Education* (published in 1967), which spelled out goals for civic education and suggested methods for their accomplishment. In May 1975, the council made a three-year commitment to citizenship education as its number one priority. A major conference on this topic was held in March of 1976 at Indianapolis, where the council identified needs in citizenship education and developed strategies for meeting those needs. Four types of needs were identified: 1) needs for philosophies of citizenship, 2) needs for reconceptualizing citizenship education, 3) operational and pedagogical needs and 4) needs for information dissemination and forums. Discussions at the conference are reported in a 17-page paper entitled *Toward a Reconceptualization of Citizenship Education*. Other activities have included regional conferences on citizenship education and a publication entitled *Building Rationales for Citizenship Education*, edited by James P. Shaver and published by NCSS in 1977. The title article by Fred Newmann, in response to the conference call for philosophies, is considered a primary document.

Another organization actively involved in citizenship education issues is the American Bar Association (ABA). Through its Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, this organization has instituted a coordinated national effort to improve citizenship education instruction — promoting "legal and civic literacy by replacing rote-memorization with critical analysis, illuminating vague abstractions through concrete examples, and complementing traditional lectures with innovative instructional techniques and real-life experiences in the community."[39] The expressed goal of the Special Committee is "to see that law is taught systematically in our schools at all levels." At present all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia, have local-school programs in law-related education. Also, more than half of the states have teacher-training programs. The committee publishes a *Directory of Law-Related Educational Activities*, as well as bibliographies, catalogues, and guidebooks — and has produced a 30-minute film called *To Reason Why*, which dramatizes the need for law studies programs. The national association acts as a catalyst and clearinghouse, and the state and local bar associations work closely with their educational counterparts to introduce and support programs that meet particular community needs and interests. These programs vary greatly from place to place, but generally they include simulations and other means of experiential learning, as well as a high degree of community-classroom interaction — in terms of field

experiences, resource persons, etc.

A recent thrust of ABA is to encourage development of model programs for infusing "law and humanities" into the elementary school curriculum — and into the school climate as well. In this effort, law-related groups around the country are working to develop their own distinct programs and materials to accomplish this goal. National Endowment for the Humanities is the funding agency and ABA is the coordinator for the project. Norman Gross is the Staff Director of the Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.

Two other organizations work through somewhat similar structures to introduce instruction regarding the free enterprise system. For many years, the Joint Council on Economic Education has worked to promote and improve instruction in economics, working usually through Centers for Economic Education — hosted by a particular university, which must provide one-half released time for an economics professor in order to qualify. There are approximately 160 centers throughout the United States. Each center develops materials, and the Joint Council acts as a clearinghouse for communication and dissemination. Founded in 1949, the Council on Economic Education now has affiliated state councils in almost every state in the Union. Better preparation for teachers through inservice training, workshops, etc. and providing high quality resource materials are the major thrusts of this organization's efforts.

The National Chamber of Commerce has also been active in promoting economic education, acting as a catalyst and clearinghouse for the efforts of the affiliated state chambers. Although much of their effort has traditionally been aimed toward adults, this organization has also produced materials for use in public schools. A major example is the Economics for Young Americans Program — which is a teacher's kit, now available in Phase I and Phase II — being used in 17,000 schools. Also, a Spanish-speaking equivalent, called Empressa, is being used in Mexico and South America as well as in the Southwestern United States. With national chamber cooperation, local chambers have also been providing a summer program in which teachers can obtain graduate credit for additional training in economics education. These sessions are conducted by the Centers for Economic Education, operated by the Council on Economic Education, as mentioned above. At present, the summer training program is operational in 30 communities within 16 states. Recently, the Chamber of Commerce and the Council on Economic Education have been exploring other ways in which they can combine efforts for better and stronger promotion of free enterprise instruction within public schools.

Global Perspectives in Education, Inc. (GPE) is a nonprofit, educational research, development, and consulting agency that is working with and through educational institutions and voluntary organizations across the country to increase American public awareness and knowledge of our global society. A journal, entitled *Intercom*, is published quarterly — providing classroom tools, resources, and ideas that promote constructive alternatives for the furtherance of democratic values and the fulfillment of global responsibilties. In addition, GPE has developed and tested K-12 curriculum materials that focus on concepts of conflict, communication, interdependence, and change — as well as significant

global issues and topics, such as environment, population pressures, social justice, and depletion of natural resources. This organization also conducts inservice, staff development, and teacher training programs with school districts throughout the United States. It is continuing the educational programs of the Center for War/Peace Studies, is affiliated with the Center for Teaching International Relations at the University of Denver, and is currently carrying out a major grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities for curriculum development and teacher training. Offices are in New York and San Francisco.

In January 1970 the American Political Science Association (APSA) established a committee on Pre-collegiate Education. This committee has two primary responsibilities. First, it provides the political science profession with a continuing assessment of the discipline's relationship with elementary and secondary education. Second, the committee develops strategies through which the intellectual resources of political science can be effectively mobilized in support of improved citizenship education at the precollegiate level. Since its inception, the committee has undertaken a wide range of projects and stimulated numerous publications related to citizen education. These include 1) the *Global Dimensions in Education* series, 2) *Political Science in the New Social Studies* — materials for civics, government, and problems of democracy and 3) *International Learning and International Education in a Global Age.*

The Social Science Education consortium (SSEC) is headquartered in Boulder, Colorado, in conjunction with the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies and Social Sciences, and directed by Irving Morrissett. This organization is a major information source — through its own publications as well as through the ERIC network. One reference booklet, for example, is *Who Teaches Citizenship? A Survey of Documents and Resources,* by Mary Jane Turner. The staff also provides technical assistance for school districts that are redesigning their social studies programs — in terms of needs assessment, goals and objectives statements, content, materials, leadership, inservice training, adapting materials to local needs, solving special problems, and evaluation. SSEC has conducted or assisted other organizations with numerous conferences and workshops, and it has developed a teacher training program in law-related education. In cooperation with Ohio State's Mershon Center, and with a grant from NIE, SSEC has recently undertaken a project to 1) identify relevant research, theory, and exemplary practices that can contribute to clarification of recurrent problems in citizenship education, and 2) formulate viable, low-cost alternative ways of approaching the problems. Four products will result from this Knowledge Interpretation Program: 1) a handbook of basic citizenship competencies, 2) an instructional briefing guide, 3) a school governance briefing guide and 4) a parent community briefing guide.

Many other organizations are involved in citizenship education. Through its School and Society Program, the Educational Development Center is carrying out several related efforts — such as the Toward Personhood and Participation project and the model program for community planning in citizenship being developed at Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Council of Chief State School Officers has developed a position statement, and its Citizenship Committee has recently released a

"Report and Action Plan." The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has funded programs in law-related education. The National Endowment of the Humanities has made substantial grants in the area of citizenship — for example, to the Law in a Free Society Program, to Global Perspectives in Education, to the ABA coordination effort, and to the Alliance for Citizen Education. The Russell Sage Foundation, the Center for Social Studies and Economic Education at George Peabody College, and the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs at Tufts University are involved. This is just a sampling. In addition, there are many organizations that promote citizenship outside the educational structure — such as the 4-H clubs, as just one example. The materials listed in the resources section can provide a guide to other organizations involved in citizenship efforts.

Program Developers

In 1971 the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, with a grant from the National Science Foundation, launched its Political Science Course Content Improvement Project. As the elementary component of the project, a task force was established for the purpose of investigating the political learning processes in childhood, re-evaluating citizenship development in terms of contemporary society, and arriving at a set of criteria for elementary-level classroom materials. Staff for the task force was provided by the Citizenship Development Program — under the direction of Richard C. Remy — of the Mershon Center, at Ohio State University.[40] This work was completed in 1974.

In an effort to translate into practice the research and theory that had emerged from this study, the Citizenship Development Program at Mershon — in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Education — took on as one of its projects the development of a set of instructional materials for citizenship education in the elementary grades. One version of the materials developed, entitled *Citizenship Decision Making: Skill Activities and Materials, Grades 4-9*, was published in 1978 by Addison-Wesley — as a set of 25 lesson plans with blackline masters for student materials, which may be used individually, taught in the sequence provided, or grouped into other sets. The program focuses on group decision making as a central and enduring task of citizenship, and the lessons present decisions ranging from the kinds children experience in their daily lives to those faced by governmental agencies. The units are 1) Decisions and You, 2) Making Decisions, 3) Judging Decisions and 4) Influencing Decisions. The developers have indicated that an important aim was to create materials that would allow students to actually experience what they are studying and that would treat students as active participants in the learning process. The lessons are meant to accommodate the pluralistic character of American society. They are intended not only to complement existing social studies materials, but also to coordinate with other curricular areas.

The high school component of the APSA study — the High School Political Science Curriculum Project — was based at the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University. The project was codirected by Judith Gillespie, Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick. The purpose of the

project was to develop, test and disseminate a two-semester program designed to serve as an alternative approach to existing 12th-grade courses in government. The resulting text entitled *American Government: Comparing Political Experiences*, and authored by Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, was published in 1978 by Prentice-Hall.

Seeking an integration of knowledge and skills, the program offers four units, all of which focus on three skill groups: 1) thinking skills — such as asking questions, using concepts, making comparisons, generating hypotheses, and valuing; 2) research skills — such as gathering data, interpreting sources of information, generating data by interviews, polls, and surveys, and forecasting with data; and 3) participation skills — such as working in groups, making decisions in groups, bargaining, managing group differences, and analyzing the different roles that people play in groups. The four units are 1) The Political Life of Citizens, including — in addition to government functions, political resources, elections, etc. — a focus on interest-groups and participation in political groups; 2) State and Local Political Activities; 3) National Political Systems; and 4) Global Political Systems.

An earlier high school program was also developed at Indiana University. The High School Curriculum Center in Government was established in 1966 to provide an alternative to secondary civics courses — an alternative that would incorporate the enormous increase in knowledge and inquiry techniques that had been developed by social scientists in the previous decade. The resulting program — authored by the director of the project, Howard Mehlinger, and the associate director, John Patrick — was piloted in 40 schools during the 1968-69 school year; a revised version was again field tested in over 50 schools, and further modifications were made before the materials were published by Ginn and Company in 1971 — and again, in a revised edition, in 1977. The course emphasizes the relationships of social factors to political behavior — in terms of political culture, political socialization, social class, status, role, etc. — so that students learn how to construct and apply conceptual frameworks to the organization and interpretation of information. Lesson sequencing and teacher strategies are organized to help students develop and test their own hypotheses and to critically judge the hypotheses of others. Case studies are used extensively as the basis for analysis of political behavior.

Materials for the course, entitled *American Political Behavior*, include films, transparencies, worksheets for duplication, evaluation materials, simulations and a game package — in addition to the five-unit text and the accompanying teacher's guide. The five units are described by the authors as follows:

1. *Introduction to the Study of Political Behavior.* Students are introduced to the meaning of political behavior, to the social science approach to the study of politics, and to the process of making value judgments and policy decisions about political affairs.
2. *Similarities and Differences in Political Behavior.* Students learn about the relationship of social factors to political attitudes and political behavior. Basic concepts are introduced such as role, socio-economic status, culture, socialization, and personality. This unit includes material about the political behavior of ethnic groups.
3. *Elections and Voting Behavior.* Lessons focus on the relationship of various social and psychological factors to voting behavior. Other topics are the formal and

informal rules that direct the election process in our society, the differences between the major political parties, and the consequences of voting behavior.

4. *Political Decision-Makers.* Students learn about the political roles of four types of public officials in the national government: the President, congressmen, bureaucrats, and judges. The rights and duties of each role type, the recruitment of individuals to the role, and the decision-making activities of the role occupant are emphasized.
5. *State and Local Decision-Makers.* Students learn about people at state and local levels of government who are important decision-makers. These people include governors, mayors, judges, state legislators, and members of city councils.

Evidence acquired from eight years of use of this program in many schools indicates that conceptual frameworks from the social sciences *can* be productively applied to civics instruction, helping students to understand and to cope more effectively with the social forces that influence their political beliefs and actions.

Another high school program, which would require somewhat more restructuring of the curriculum, has been proposed by Fred Newmann and reported with co-authors Thomas Bertocci and Ruthanne Landsness, as *Skills in Citizen Action: An English-Social Studies Program for Secondary Schools.* The plan is now being piloted in a Madison, Wis., high school. This group set about to design a program that is sensitive to institutional factors and concerns of various other civic education approaches — yet begins with an overall conception of what civic competency *is*, and then proceeds to the formulation of experiences that could realistically teach those competencies. The primary civic competency is seen as the ability to exert influence in public affairs, since this is the key to representative democracy; but not in the sense of having one's way, or even one's say, in every event that comes along — rather in the sense of "having some impact in public affairs consistent with intentions [developed] through a process of rational moral deliberation."[41] Secondary, supporting competencies — needed to "formulate goals, win support for them, and thereby exert influence" — are seen as the following: 1) communicate effectively in spoken and written language; 2) collect and logically interpret information on problems of public concern; 3) describe political-legal decision making processes; 4) rationally justify personal decisions on controversial public issues and strategies for action, with reference to principles of justice and constitutional democracy; 5) work cooperatively with others; 6) discuss concrete personal experiences of self and others in ways that contribute to resolution of personal dilemmas encountered in civic action and that relate these experiences to more general human issues; and 7) use selected technical skills as they are required for exercise of influence on specific issues.

In order to teach these competencies, a year-long program for the 11th or 12th grade has been proposed, wherein students would spend most of the day (9:30-2:00) in the Citizen Action program. They would earn the equivalent of two academic credits in English and two in social studies and would be able to take one additional course as well as participate in cocurricular activities. As a way of preparing students for active involvement, the program begins with a political/legal processes course and a communications course. Another course, taken later, is "Action in Literature." In the activity component of the program, students would spend two full mornings per week for one semester in volunteer service

positions in social agencies, government bodies, public interest groups, etc. and would spend four mornings per week another semester working for political candidates, helping to establish special youth institutions, promoting revision of administrative regulation, lobbying for legislation, etc. These activities would be accompanied by "skill clinics" for learning necessary techniques and "project counseling sessions" where issues arising out of the work are discussed. Near the end of the project, each citizen action group would develop a "public message" to commmunicate the meaning of its work to peers and the public at large. The developers present this model not as a tested and verified "package" that is immediately adaptable to any school, but rather as a conception of civic competence that can give direction for local educators who want to take civic education seriously while still meeting other obligations and constraints. They recommend beginning with a pilot program of 60 volunteer students and a teaching team with the equivalent of two full time teachers, one in English and one in social studies.

Three similarly innovative programs — supported with funds from the Danforth Foundation — are examples of efforts to translate results of Lawrence Kohlberg's research into civic education programs in the schools. The Kohlberg research indicates that most high school students have not developed the ability to think abstractly or at a mature enough level to understand the principles which underlie the Constitution or even to understand it as a "law and order" document. Many students have limited social perspectives and limited role-taking abilities — two prerequisites for advanced stages of civic and moral thought. All three programs, therefore, are based on concepts labeled "cognitive moral development": "cognitive" because of stress on organized thought processes; "moral" because of decision making activities involving universal values; and "development" because of evidence that quality of thinking can be improved. The three programs are operating in 1) Cambridge High and Latin School, 2) the School-Within-a-School at Brookline High School, and 3) five schools in the Pittsburgh area and two schools in Bakersfield, California. Lawrence Kohlberg (Harvard) supervises the Cambridge program; Ralph Mosher (Boston University) works with the Brookline group; and Edwin Fenton (Carnegie-Mellon University) coordinates the work of the seven schools in CMU's Civic Education Program.

The Cambridge and Bookline groups pioneered in the development of two basic intervention techniques: 1) moral discussion and 2) a participatory governmental structure. Moral discussions involve hypothetical dilemmas in which two or more basic values come in conflict. The participatory governmental structure, called a "Just Community School" by Kohlberg, involves students in making and carrying out rules governing such issues as cutting school, stealing, or disrupting classes. A substantial body of research indicates that discussions of moral dilemmas facilitate the development of high stages of thought — as does participation in this type of "town meeting." In addition, the programs help to develop a humanistic atmosphere in the school and to bring the "hidden" curriculum into line with formal government classes. Students enrolled in these programs take both social studies and English from teachers who participate in the governance structure, and the curriculum is

made up of mini-courses specially designed to link formal learning with informal learning.

The Carnegie-Mellon group has attempted to organize a comprehensive civic education program — with five sets of goals. They are 1) the development of such basic participatory skills as reading, writing, listening, speaking, chairing a meeting and negotiating with authorities; 2) the development of problem solving abilities through the growth of formal operational thought; 3) personal development — i.e. self-knowledge, self-esteem and the development of an individual identity; 4) the development of democratic values and the ability to understand values at the higher stages of thought on the Kohlberg Scale; and 5) a wide range of knowledge goals. The CMU Project has developed three year-long social studies courses, three parallel literature courses, and a three-year writing program. In addition to studying English and social studies in the program five days a week, students spend three additional periods weekly in community activities that include a participatory governmental structure modeled largely after the Cambridge and Brookline projects. This comprehensive program attempts to bring together many of the elements of other civic education projects, including units in global education, a course in political science, placements in community organizations, techniques for personal development — as pioneered by humanistic educators, and a heavy stress on basic skills development.

One of the most successful of the many law-related projects is the Law in a Free Society Program, directed by Charles Quigley and headquartered in Santa Monica, California. This program is the result of a civic education project of the State Bar of California, with the cooperation of the University of California and with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Danforth Foundation, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the California Council on Criminal Justice. It has been designed for implementation by school systems and other interested groups at a minimum of expense and outside assistance. The project offers three resources: 1) materials for staff training, 2) a classroom materials program and 3) consultant assistance. Training and classroom materials are available in six modules (K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 5-6, 7-9, and 10-12) for each of the eight concepts developed throughout the program: 1) authority, 2) privacy, 3) responsibility, 4) participation, 5) property, 6) diversity, 7) freedom and 8) justice. Classroom materials feature the coordinated use of filmstrips — presenting "chapters" in a usually fanciful and humorous story — and student resource books; they also promote guided discussions, role playing, and a variety of other teaching methods in order to stimulate students and help them acquire knowledge and skills necessary for the analysis of conflicts, legal and political problems, and alternative situations — with attention to underlying values.

The Institute for Political/Legal Education — started in 1969 by Barry Lefkowitz, a classroom teacher in New Jersey — is now the center for a nationally validated Title IV-C project that has won acceptance into the curricula of more than 400 schools in 40 states. The project offers programs for the secondary level, the upper elementary/middle school level, and adult education. In addition to the development of programs, the staff produces and disseminates materials, conducts workshops, and holds a model congress for students and teachers. The institute always

recommends that, before any part of its curriculum is implemented, 1) a mini-board of advisors representing different segments of the community discuss and approve the program and 2) teachers attend a training workshop.

At present, the elementary-middle school curriculum offers a legal component — with three manuals: *Lawmaking, Juvenile Problems and Law*, and *Youth Attitudes and Police*.[42] The adult education curriculum offers a political/legal component — dealing with registering to vote, casting a ballot, influencing the passage of laws, and being arrested. The secondary, year-long curriculum includes a political component — centering around voter education; a governmental component — making use of the manual *Government: The Decision Making Process;* and a legal component — dealing with individual rights, fair trial vs. a free press, law and the family and juvenile justice. Materials are flexible and their use in various schools ranges from picking up a unit or two to implementing a complete program at all levels. A wide range of teaching strategies is used, including oral reporting colloquiums, case study methods, class inquiry discussion, value analysis exercises, simulations, role-playing and socio-drama, brainstorming, mock trials, community-based exercises — such as topical neighborhood research, and student interning. The internship experience complements the government unit. Students might spend as many as 20 days working in the office of a legislator, the governor, a lobbyist, a state agency, in city hall, or at headquarters of a special-interest organization like Common Cause. A test of political and legal knowledge, often given before and after the course both to participating students and a control group, has consistently disclosed more knowledge and political awareness on the part of participating students. An activity interest scale is also used for evaluating affective growth — in terms of interest as well as feelings of confidence for participating in the political/legal process.

Organized in 1965, the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF) has developed a number of programs to help students realize their rights and responsibilities as members of our society. Operating from a belief that preparing young people for thoughtful and active citizenship is the cooperative responsibility of the schools, the bar, and other public institutions, all CFR programs include a high degree of community interaction. Foremost among their programs are the following: 1) Youth and Administration of Justice, a secondary program combining curriculum materials (now being published by Scholastic), field experiences, use of resource persons, and peer and cross-age teaching; 2) teacher training programs in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Chicago on criminal, juvenile, and consumer law; 3) the *Bill of Rights in Action* series, a quarterly publication available by current subscription and by past-issue class sets — with each issue focusing on a separate topic, such as "Supreme Court Highlights," "Crime, Youth and the Police," and "How Schools Integrate"; 4) adult community education programs; 5) classroom materials, including role-playing and simulation games; 6) Law Day — in California — placing attorneys in the schools for a day, operating throughout the year and culminating in a conference; and 7) national and state conferences, emphasizing the joint responsibility of schools and governmental agencies to develop programs for the young. CFR is headquartered in Los Angeles, with offices also in Chicago and

Philadelphia. Executive director is Vivian Monroe and education director is Todd Clark. Although program materials are designed to minimize the need for outside assistance by implementing districts, CFR does provide consultive services as well as training and technical assistance.

The Mini-Society Program was developed at the University of California, Los Angeles, by Marilyn Kourilsky. It is sponsored in Colorado and Kansas by the state Council for Economic Education, and has received support from the Mott Foundation. In this program, the teacher is presented with a set of procedures for helping children in grades 3-6 generate a working economic system in the classroom. The system is initiated by experiencing an economic problem, such as not enough felt tip pens to go around. The children enact several solutions to the problems of scarcity and eventually try out a system of exchange markets, wherein each person can "pay for what you want." Later the children begin to buy and sell goods and services, renting space in the classroom for conducting their business — and hiring the teacher as a consultant. Situations introduced next challenge the students to develop institutions in order to facilitate the smooth operation of their system. An income tax leads to the formation of a representative type government. Frequently, "international" trade develops between several mini-society classes in the school. Throughout the program, the teacher "debriefs" economic dilemmas as they occur in the classroom — for example, loss of customers by irrational pricing. Other programs utilizing the experiential approach were also developed — the Kinder-Economy, the Max-Economy for junior high, and the Max-Economy for high school. Throughout the whole series, labeled KEEP (Kourilsky Experienced-based Education Program), three fundamental principles of learning are applied to the teaching of economics: learning is enhanced when students participate in 1) real as opposed to vicarious experiences, 2) active rather than passive roles in the learning situation and 3) actual decision-making whose consequences they will bear.

There are many other programs that relate to citizenship education. The St. Louis Law in Action project and the Street Law project of Georgetown University are law-related programs that have expanded far beyond the local area where they were developed. Close-Up is a government participatory program through which students in grades 10, 11, and 12 can experience week-long, highly intensive workshops in Washington, D.C. — with guided opportunity to question many of the key people within and outside of government who are influencing public policy. The Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education is devoted exclusively to educating for responsible, successful living in a fast-changing, interdependent global community. The action-based program by Junior Achievement fosters leadership, decision-making, and consensus building skills as well as knowledge and skills directly related to the free-enterprise system. The National Commission on Resources for Youth sponsors demonstration projects, such as Youth Tutoring Youth and Youth Helper in Day Care. In the YMCA's Youth and Government program, 9th to 12th graders in 41 states participate in a number of activities relating to the political/governmental system. A media program is *Trade-Offs*, designed to teach economics to 9-13-year-olds and produced by a several-state consortium of Councils for Economic

Education. Another is *30 Minutes*, a weekly CBS program for youth, with a news magazine format — and with the National Street Law Institute participating in a segment devoted to legal issues of concern to young people, such as school locker searches, consumer problems, etc. This has been but a general sampling. Others can be found through the materials and organizations listed in the resources section.

Where Is It Going?

Trends

Citizenship education has become a *movement* in the truest sense. Much is happening, and the situation in the field this year is considerably different from what it was last year. Efforts expended from several directions have begun to show results. First, it was necessary to get people's attention — to get them thinking about citizenship and realizing the need for making improvements in citizenship education. Although only a small percentage of districts have been affected so far, the attention of a number of educators, public officials, funding sources, legislators, organizations, program developers and individuals has, by this time, been brought to bear on the problems in this area; and their contributions are helping to secure the interest of others. Some momentum has been achieved, and current efforts will serve to accelerate it even further. Citizenship education is sure to be a bigger issue next year — reaching more people than it is now. Some of the present trends can serve to indicate the directions that the movement is likely to take.

Most important, some coordination efforts are beginning to emerge. One aspect of this effort is the development of frameworks, rationales and guidelines. In 1977, Fred Newmann — for the National Council for the Social Studies — made a definitive statement regarding the elements that should be considered in building a rationale for a comprehensive citizenship education program in tune with 20th century circumstances. Briefly outlined, these elements are

1. Curriculum goals — which are based on
   a. the nature of the values held
   b. the nature of social reality
   c. the nature of knowledge
2. The nature of learning — taking into consideration
   a. social learning theories, including those of the behaviorists, the modelists, and the institutionists
   b. organismic development theories, including Piaget's cognitive development model, Kohlberg's moral development theories, Erikson's stages in the life cycle, and Loevinger's "pre-social" to "integrated" pattern
   c. dialectical synergism, positing an unending process in which people develop by coping with tensions, contradictions, and ambiguities as inevitable and even exciting conditions of human existence
3. Definition of community — i.e. the group reference for civic education: families, religious organizations, ethnic-cultural groups, occupational organizations, social welfare institutions, municipalities, counties, states, nation, world, human species, universe?

4. The total school goals and priorities — including integration of curriculums and sequence
5. Other social agencies — including the extent to which school and non-school institutions are to be relied upon
6. Authenticity — i.e. consistency between goals and processes
7. Diversity — considering what forms of citizenship education are most appropriate for various kinds of people.[43]

In 1978 Russell Hill and Joan Wallace created such a rationale for the task forces working to develop programs in Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and for others. The elements discussed in this particular conceptualization can be summarized as follows:

1. Authority — from what source is the citizen education program empowered?
2. Leadership and Participation — who has the right and the ability to assume responsibility?
3. Values and Principles — what fundamental values will underlie the program?
4. Scope of Community — will the program take a global, national, or regional perspective; or a combination?
5. Development Process — what process should create the program?
6. Societal problems — what and how specific should be the issues addressed?
7. Political/social perspectives — will the program spring from liberal or conservative views, from industrial or post-industrial perspectives, etc.?
8. Content — what is to be included and how is it to be arranged?
9. Learning theory — will information processing, developmental, conditioning, social-learning, humanities, or socialization theories — or a combination — serve to shape the program?
10. Objectives — what in concrete, specific terms is being attempted?
11. Instructional modes — will the desired knowledge, skills, and dispositions be taught by means of formal classroom instruction, interpersonal relations, institutional climate, parent involvement, community involvement, media — or a combination?
12. Instructional design — will the program's organizational structure be a core curriculum, a spiral curriculum, an infusion model, or a "Just School" model?[44]

Coming up in 1979, the Mershon/SSEC Knowledge Interpretation Program will seek to integrate theory and promising practices into guidelines for program developers, policy makers, administrators, teachers, parents, and communities. All of these efforts to provide an "overview" will contribute to broader conceptualizations and thus eventually to broader programs.

At the program level, some increases in the scope of particular activities is now noticeable. The Carnegie-Mellon Civic Education Program — discussed previously — attempts to bring together elements from several approaches into a comprehensive program. This model is receiving increasing notice and is being introduced into areas other than

Pennsylvania and California — as in the Cherry Creek Schools near Denver, for example. Fred Newmann's proposal also attempts to include various interest-group concerns as well as to cut across disciplinary boundaries and to utilize a variety of instructional modes. The American Bar Association is encouraging coordination between law and other aspects of the humanities and a more general infusion into the school curriculum and climate. The Mini-Society program teaches concepts of government, politics and interpersonal relations, as well as economics. A new history course being developed by the Education Development Center's School and Society Program will take a pluralistic approach.[45] The Mershon Center has done a study on the relationship between consumer and citizen education.[46] While these are beginning efforts and much remains to be done, the emergence of a trend toward broader approaches is an indication that the need for coordination and synthesis is recognized and will no doubt receive further attention.

Also, the idea of a national group or center is growing. The Kansas City participants indicated a need for not only an alliance — which is now underway — but also for the ultimate establishment of a "national commission on citizenship education." The Kettering/Danforth task force proposed the need for a "coordinating agency to perform tasks on a national level, making use of existing dissemination channels." The task force commissioned by the Office of Education called for a national-level commission "to develop a framework and goals for citizen education in the United States." Research for Better Schools is continuing its work to create a "national center for citizenship education." A major foundation is considering the establishment of a "national commission." Although there is some opposition to the idea of national guidelines — and particularly to any national control — the number of persons and groups promoting such a concept suggests that some national level of coordination is generally desired.

Meanwhile, dialogue is occurring in various ways. In addition to the conferences, task forces and workshops sponsored by OE's Citizen Education Office, its recent series of papers presents a type of written dialogue. Other groups have been and are instrumental in bringing people together in various types of meetings to address concepts and issues in citizenship education. The Alliance for Citizen Education has as its primary purpose dialogue among persons of differing points of view. In addition to these more formal opportunities for sharing viewpoints, there are informal, personal links between otherwise independent groups. For example, Todd Clark, whose name is affiliated with law-related education, is vice president of the National Council for the Social Studies. Charlotte Anderson is now associated with the American Bar Association's legal approach, while her husband Lee Anderson is a noted figure within the political approach. Howard Mehlinger, who is involved in global as well as social studies approaches, is on the advisory commission for the ABA Special Committee on Youth Education — as are Fred Newmann and Edwin Fenton, who have been working with action-skills, self-governing components and developmental concepts. These interlacing connections, continuing public dialogue, the possibility of a national coordinating group, and the further production and dissemination of literature with stress on the need for synthesis, will lead to additional integration of now

rather separate facets — i.e. new ways for utilizing the benefits of diversity while still following an integrated program.

Other trends are 1) state mandates — requiring instruction in either "citizenship" or a specific aspect of it, such as "free-enterprise"; 2) more attention to the elementary grades in the development of programs and materials — with a number of law-related programs, for example, now shifting developmental interest to elementary/middle school levels; and 3) significant although scattered research on various aspects of citizenship education — such as media impact, attitudinal studies, exploration of relationships, dimensions of a child's political world, etc. Enough activity has occurred in these directions to label them as trends, but the major characteristics of the movement remain much the same: 1) its limited reach — i.e. the number of schools still not involved, and 2) its fragmented nature — i.e. a narrow base of interest behind many programs being developed, so that within the schools that are involved, overlapping and independent approaches are common.

Needs

In spite of obvious progress within the past few years, many gaps remain to be filled. One of these is empirical or systematically acquired knowledge available to those attempting to influence the development of "good" citizenship. Following is a partial list of areas where research is needed:

1. Media — the impact that mass media have upon not only political and social attitudes, but also political and social behavior; developmental possibilities for educational use of electronic media technology; effects of the electronic media upon patterns of learning; media-responsibility; etc.
2. Pluralism — the meanings and effects of diversity upon policy choices; unifying strands that can give cohesiveness to a pluralistic society; possible balances between equity and efficiency; etc.
3. Participation — effects that various types of experiences have upon inclination and ability to participate; effects that participation has upon the individual; the effects of fuller participation upon social and political systems.
4. Change — the nature of change; the dynamics of effecting change; past models for change and their effectivness — such as political or "power" models, technological models, social or "community" models, etc.; the "change agent" as a social role; effects of change upon individuals, groups, systems, futures.
5. Futures — rigorous methods for extrapolating from present situations and possible interventions; large-scale cause and effect relationships; moral and ethical implications; etc.
6. Relationships — overlap between facets of citizenship; mutual exclusions; common elements; possible reinforcements; methods for holistic conceptualizations of what appear now as related but independent concerns.
7. Communities — factors of cohesiveness or isolation; contributions to civic attitudes, knowledge, skills, etc. on the part of various agents within different sizes and types of communities;

factors in community-wide planning for citizenship; relationships between in-school and out-of-school learning.

8. Evaluation — development of techniques for determining achievement of objectives other than the acquisition of knowledge; techniques for multi-variable analysis of cultural influences; studies of the effects of recent or current teaching related to citizenship.
9. School governance — policy structures; effects of such structures upon individual self-image, community attitudes, learning, participation, etc.; training methods for school administrators; relationships between training and types of governance structures, public contact, etc.; the actual role of school boards in the governance processes; patterns of representation within school boards; mechanisms for public input into educational decision making.

Anyone active in the field would no doubt come up with a different list, or at least have items to add. These suggestions have been made, however, to indicate the extent and significance of the lack of solid knowledge.

Another noticeable gap is in conceptualizations, experimentation, development of models, and testing of models. Models are needed, for example, in regard to public participation in mass media — such as Columbus, Ohio, is doing with interactive television — as well as other public uses of television; methods for making mass media more responsive to social needs, without government ownership; ways of encouraging professional-level television programming of a public service nature; and other innovative means for coping with the impact of mass media, particularly the electronic media. Other models are especially needed in such areas as 1) the application of research findings — as in the Mershon elementary program, for example; 2) the teaching of participatory skills; 3) balanced, comprehensive programs; 4) sequential programs; 5) ways of infusing citizenship education throughout the curriculum and the school climate; 6) alternative forms of school governance; 7) community planning for citizenship; and 8) cooperative programs between schools and community groups or agencies.

Innovative conceptualizations are needed — based upon such criteria as that included in the previous section, as well as upon an awareness of recent research — to serve as a foundation for the formulation of programs. Creative but practical applications of theory are needed for the design of single-level or sequential programs and for the development of student/teacher materials usable in specific learning situations. Programs and materials should be tested in various school settings to determine their workability and the factors that affect their success. An assessment should be made of the ways in which program implementation impacts the school and of the types of training needed for the average teacher and/or administrator. Ideally, training activities will be developed and offered as a first step in adopting a program. Finally, various means should be undertaken for evaluating the effects of the new program on student behaviors and attitudes, as well as upon testable knowledge. Because all of these steps are important, the development of a good model requires a

considerable span of time as well as a large investment of resources — in terms of both human talent and financial support. Although some notable work has been done in the development of models, much more is needed — particularly for comprehensive and sequential programs, infusion methods, alternative forms of governance, and community involvement (or initiative) in planning or choosing programs.

A third need is for an informative network — a systematic way to make current information and developments readily available in a readily understandable form to anyone concerned with improving citizenship education. Too much is happening — from too many directions — for the average policy-making groups or individuals to collect and assimilate it without assistance. Program developers, community leaders, classroom teachers, and interested citizens are among those who would also benefit from easier access to information. A related informational need is for 1) objective descriptions of programs and materials that are available for school or other group use — in terms of the scope, emphasis, underlying values — and/or 2) guidelines for groups who wish to assess, on their own, materials being considered for adoption. Included in such guidelines could be ways for determining how well the particular scope and emphasis of considered programs or materials actually meet the state or local district or community goals for citizenship education. For example, in a community where a number of persons believe in "shared responsibility" as an organizational base, there would probably be objections to materials that place high emphasis upon authority structures. Other types of guidelines are also needed, such as one presenting — in as clear and concise a way as possible — the full range of factors that decision-making groups should consider in mandating, developing, or adopting programs. Creating information through research and developing alternative models based on the best available information are important, but without the means for getting these results to the interested public and to policy makers, little benefit will be seen. On the other hand, an efficient information network can lead to surprising results in a relatively short time — as evidenced by that of the American Bar Association.

Finally, there is a need to follow through with training programs — both preservice and inservice — that prepare teachers and administrators to carry out the kinds of programs that may be decided upon. Training is an available or inherent part of some of the programs discussed earlier, but a much wider base for the development of training programs is also needed. The concepts, methods and models now being developed must be further incorporated into college and university teacher training activities and into inservice, summer, or workshop programs before any wide-scale implementation can occur effectively on the secondary and elementary levels. Training for community and organizational leaders and for agency officials — as well as for interested citizens — is also needed if community-wide programs are the desired goal. This is the critical area that will ultimately determine whether or not any extensive changes in citizenship education will result from all the other efforts. If communities don't know how to arrive at consensus or how to plan; if administrators don't know how to deal with humanistic, participatory structures; and/or if teachers utilize content and methods that ignore current findings, needs, or wishes of the public — then no significant amount of progress in these directions is

possible. The needs are great, requiring considerable and wide-spread support over an extended period of time. Thus, probably the overriding need is still — as in the beginning of the movement — interest and support.

Suggestions for Action

All persons concerned about public education or about social problems prevalent today can play a part in this movement. The activities suggested below are offered mainly as a stimulus to generate other ideas for action.

At the **STATE LEVEL**, it is suggested that

. . . policy makers and curriculum consultants set aside time to become more fully informed about the citizenship education issue. This paper — particularly section two "What Are the Issues? — is a good starting point, as is the Office of Education's paper *Citizen Education Today: Developing Civic Competencies.* Other materials are listed in the "Resources" section of this paper, along with a list of organizations and contact persons.

. . . state education agencies make a commitment to citizenship education as an important central area, affecting the total educational process. In some states, this has been done by assigning staff to provide the necessary leadership for addressing the issue. Another form of commitment is to establish mechanisms for securing the views of a number of persons from various interests, in order to deal with the definitions of citizenship and to guide state policy in citizenship education. Scholars with expertise in various aspects of citizenship education, administrators, teachers, students, and lay citizens representative of various professions and occupations could be brought together in a task force to work on these matters over a certain period of time. Because of the differences in perspective, as well as differences in vocabulary, such a group will first have to learn how to talk with each other; for this reason, the first meeting might be devoted mainly to developing an understanding of the various views represented and the ways of talking about citizenship. Professional assistance in facilitating communication might also be considered. If such a task force is established, however, and given time to read and study the issue, as well as to learn from each other, the concensus that evolves is more likely to be one that will command public acceptance and support. There are other models for securing input; but whatever method is used, it is important in an area like citizenship education that wide representation be achieved and reflected in resultant state policy.

. . . state education agencies, after in-depth study of the issue and consensus work with representative groups, provide guidelines for local education agencies in the form of criteria to be considered in developing or choosing local programs. Also, readily available resource materials are needed by local districts — such as 1) general information, to promote awareness and understanding; 2) detailed descriptions of model programs and names of contact persons; 3) objective evaluations

of available programs/materials in terms of the citizenship goals addressed, underlying values, and demonstrated results from ongoing projects. Persons from the state education agency could serve as consultants to local schools — and to state legislators as well. Statewide or cooperative regional conferences might be helpful for stimulating awareness, for information dissemination and exchange, for consensus building, and for increasing appreciation of different values and approaches.

. . . *state legislators be aware of the full scope of citizenship education concerns if they are considering legislation affecting local programs.* Particularly, legislators might be cautious of requiring instruction in only one aspect of citizenship education without full understanding of the other aspects and how they relate. Also, early in the legislative process, specific information might be sought in regard to change mechanisms and training procedures that may be essential to implementation.

. . . *states building minimum competency programs that include a citizenship component be aware of the need to coordinate general development of citizenship objectives with the standard-setting process.* Minimum competency standards should reflect the basic elements of the desired citizenship education program, but should not limit that broader program.

. . . *state education leaders consider giving support and assistance in the development of a national resource center for citizenship education.* The formation of such a center could help to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, but most importantly could provide a wide range of resources and an information network.

. . . *state colleges and universities offering teacher training programs and/or administrative training make citizenship education a component of those programs.* Training activities should generate awareness of both broad and narrow definitions of citizenship, should promote skills in participatory governance and group decision making, and should insure knowledge of current social circumstances — such as the new pluralism, interest-group politics, and world interdependence — as well as historic circumstances related to democratic self-governance. Teacher training efforts might include attention to ways in which responsible citizenship can be promoted within many teaching areas and within co-curricular activities.

At the **NATIONAL LEVEL**, it is suggested that

. . . *national organizations support and work cooperatively with any developing national resource center for citizenship education.* Such a center could serve as a clearinghouse, a communications facilitator, and a resource for national, state, local, and private agencies dealing with

citizenship issues. Research could be coordinated, not only in terms of knowing what other research is already under way, but also in terms of making research findings readily available from a single source. Another function of such a center might be to conduct national and/or regional forums to assist in filtering out the common or basic elements among various interests relevant to citizenship education, in order to assist states in clarifying definitions and goals for citizenship education. Also, such a center could assist states and local districts in objective evaluations of existing programs — in terms of the range of citizenship goals addressed, the underlying values, and demonstrated effects — for the purpose of matching programs with local goals.

. . . *national foundations and organizations support and conduct research and model programs to better determine effective approaches to education for citizenship.* Work on overall conceptualizations of citizenship education and experimentation with model programs are areas where national foundations and organizations can make valuable contributions. Also, programs are needed to provide training experiences for community leaders. (See "Needs," pp. 44-47 for a fuller discussion.)

. . . *program developers and publishers of materials consider the full range of citizenship goals.* It is helpful if programs and materials offered in the name of citizenship either address a full range of citizenship concerns, or state clearly the particular aspects focused upon and how those relate to other concerns that are not addressed. Programs and materials could be designed to coordinate with related and/or supplementary programs and activities — for use by districts wishing to take a broad approach. Attention could well be given to development of citizenship concerns within materials for all academic areas.

. . . *the Federal Communications Commission explore ways to promote responsible and respectful use of the mass media, particularly television, as a powerful instrument capable of undue influence, especially in terms of value systems.* Means might be sought to assess and ameliorate the effects of sensationalism, to counter this natural tendency in attracting mass audiences, and to promote the more positive effects of mass media. Perhaps incentives could be provided for companies that seek and follow a broadly-representative input into their policy and decision-making processes — not in terms of whether people choose to watch or turn off the set, but in terms of what is felt to promote or detract from character building, "good" citizenship, personal growth, etc. Support could be provided for model programs that combine professional communications expertise with common public interest.

. . . *the U.S. Office of Education continue a commitment to citizenship, with at least one staff person who is expert in matters of citizenship education.* Some means for coordination of citizenship concerns would be very helpful, as elements of citizenship education are now scattered in various programs and offices. Support and cooperation is needed for

any national resource center that might develop and for other national organizations working to promote better education for citizenship. By means of forums and a widely representative task force, national (and international) needs in regard to citizenship education could be articulated and offered as guidelines for states to consider in their design of criteria to guide, in turn, the development of local programs.

... *The Education Commission of the States make its constituents (state governors, legislators, education officials, and concerned citizens) aware of the central importance of citizenship education.* It could expand its network of contacts in order to function as a national resource center for citizenship education, or it could establish a project to work cooperatively with such a center elsewhere and/or with the U.S. Office of Education to 1) provide a communications and information network of value to the states, 2) track state-level policy, 3) develop basic criteria for decision making in regard to citizenship education, 4) provide resources and technical assistance to state education agencies and state policy makers and 5) locate and compare model procedures and programs. These efforts could be designed to direct information and assistance to state decision makers and, through them, to local districts that are deciding on policy in regard to citizenship education.

At the **LOCAL LEVEL,** it is suggested that

... *community leaders promote mechanisms enabling the community to assess various influences upon both youth and adults and to plan programs for intervention or enhancement of those influences where considered desirable by community consensus.* Citizenship is a life-long developmental process, and education for responsible citizenship ought to be an obligation of all social units, organizations, and agencies — not just the schools. Because citizenship necessarily cuts across academic disciplines and areas of public concern, however, coordination is especially important; communities can serve as a base for such coordination. Community leaders, other community agents, schools, and representatives from professional and ethnic groups could work together to establish overall goals for citizenship and to plan programs addressing the full range of goals. Some programs could be purely in-school, some could be purely community-based, and some could be a mixture of both.

... *local schools give increasing attention to overall school governance structures and the hidden messages that they transmit.* The tone and atmosphere within classrooms might be cooperatively appraised to determine consistency with the formal curriculum. There could be an assessment of the opportunities available for such experiences as group decision making, taking responsibility for decisions made, influencing politically determined decisions, respecting and appreciating differences, facing moral dilemmas, being involved with the community. The processes for decision making, program administration, disciplinary action, and curriculum development might be assessed in light of citizenship concerns.

. . . within the formal, content component of citizenship education in the local schools, a coordinated and sequenced program be the goal — so that all recognizable areas of citizenship are dealt with at appropriate times and in appropriate courses. Redesigning and updating curriculum may be preferable to adding independent courses or units. Total-school coordination is likely to be more effective than assigning citizenship education responsibilities to the social studies department and missing other possible influences and opportunities. A citizenship committee might be helpful in the continuous effort usually necessary for keeping a broad view of citizenship. Such a group could issue citizenship bulletins from time to time — or could arrange speakers or workshops — in order to stimulate ideas, to remind teachers in all curriculum areas of citizenship concerns, to announce available training opportunities, and to give other information.

. . . local school administrators seek out additional training in participatory governance structures. Particularly, it will be helpful if a high amount of skill is developed in the administration of procedures and mechanisms for working with community leaders, other social agents, students, and concerned citizens in arriving at educational decisions. Also, administrators need to be well informed of the broad range of citizenship concerns as well as being familiar with any state guidelines. In states without state criteria regarding citizenship, administrators might alert the state education agency to the need for assistance.

. . . local districts provide opportunities for in-service training to improve teacher understanding of citizenship concerns and to provide some of the skills and techniques needed to update programs. In states where training programs and or consultants are not readily available, local districts might appeal to state education agencies and to state universities for assistance. Materials can be made available to teachers to increase their awareness of the need to update and broaden efforts in citizenship education.

As mentioned earlier, these suggested activities do not by any means exhaust the possibilities and are given merely as starting points or as stimuli to other ideas. State and local talent and resourcefulness are needed to bring citizenship education once again to the forefront of educational concerns. This is a complex area that is difficult to deal with, but one that is worthy of sustained attention. If pursued, such attention will no doubt provide clearer views of the process called "citizenship," of the ways the process can be enhanced for more people, and of the role that schools can most effectively play in that enhancement. The time is right for such action.

Footnotes

[1] "Historical Perspective on Civic Education in the United States," *Education for Responsible Citizenship: The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education*. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977), p. 47.

[2] This history is taken from "Historical Perspective on Civic Education in the United States" by R. Freeman Butts, *Ibid.* See also Richard C. Remy, "Introduction: The Historical Framework" in *Citizen Education Today*, a draft report prepared by the National Center for Voluntary Action under contract with the U.S. Office of Education, n.d., pp. iii-vii.

[3] As quoted by Butts, "Historical Perspective," pp. 52-53.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

[6] Howard D. Mehlinger, "The Crisis in Civic Education," *Education for Responsible Citizenship, op. cit.*, p. 76. See also *Citizen Education Today*, pp. 5-8.

[7] *Education for Responsible Citizenship*, pp. 165-174.

[8] See "The Role and Responsibility of Television in Civic Education," *Education for Responsible Citizenship*, pp. 165-174.

[9] "Toward a Reconceptualization of Citizenship Education: Report of a Conference," (March, 1976; Indianapolis) by The National Council for the Social Studies, p. 4.

[10] *Education and Citizenship: A Conference Report*, published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Denver, Colorado, n.d., pp. 13-14.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[12] "Toward a Reconceptualization," p. 6.

[13] "The Case for Citizenship Education" in *Education for Responsible Citizenship*, p. 2.

[14] *Phi Delta Kappan* (September, 1976), p. 132; as quoted by Richard Remy in *Citizen Education Today*, p. 24.

[15] "The Challenge of Citizenship Education Today," Chapter I of *Citizen Education Today*, p. 25.

[16] "Toward a Reconceptualization," p. 7.

[17] *Citizen Education Today*, pp. 11-12.

[18] See Remy's discussion in *Citizen Education Today*, pp. 29-31.

[19] Emphasis added. Ralph W. Tyler, "The Total Educational Environment" in *Education for Responsible Citizenship*, pp. 16, 18, 16. See also Richard Remy *Citizen Education Today*, pp. 17-24.

[20] Remy, *Citizen Education Today*, p. 26.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24.

[22] From Martin Mayer, *Where, When and Why: Social Studies in American Schools* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 96-99; as quoted by Richard Remy, *Citizen Education Today*, p. 9.

[23] Fred M. Newmann, "Building a Rationale for Citizenship Education," in *Building Rationales for Citizenship Education*, ed. by James P. Shaver, National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin 52. *Selected Readings in Citizen Education: A National Conference on "Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good*, September, 1976; Kansas City, Missouri; Donald W. Robinson, ed. (U.S. Office of Education, n.d.).

[24] The exception is Utah — which does, however, require "instruction for development of character habits" including "respect for the Constitution of the United States." (53-14-10). For a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of state statutes in regard to these topics, see — particularly Chapter Three — *Education Law and Education Innovation: How State Laws and Regulations on Teaching and Learning Have Affected Law-Related Education*, a paper submitted to the Ford Foundation in July, 1978, by the Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship of the American Bar Association.

[25] Nebraska, Minnesota, Maryland, and Texas, for example. In the latter state, a teacher can be fined up to $500.00 for not teaching "patriotism" for ten minutes each day. *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[26] These counts were taken from working materials of the Research and Information Department, Education Commission of the States.

[27] "State Activity: Minimal Competency Testing," a chart prepared by Chris Pipho, Associate Director, Department of Research and Information, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado, July 10, 1978, and disseminated in xeroxed form.

[28] Published as *Ethical-Citizenship Education: Policies and Programs: A National Survey of State Education Agencies* (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Spring 1977).

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 4. The thirty-one states making major revisions are Alabama, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, New York, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-9.

[31] Thirty-three states have introduced ethnic studies into their curriculum, according to a paper by The Educational Development Center entitled "The American Experiment: E. Pluribus Unum (p. 2). It may also be helpful to note the extent to which energy education is now receiving attention in the states. According to a 1978 survey for The Education Commission of the States, approximately 75% of all state education agencies have at least one staff person whose direct responsibilities include K-12 energy education. Activities range from development of grade specific curriculum enrichment materials (Iowa, Washington) to implementation of energy awareness workshops for teachers (Ohio) to the development of a comprehensive K-12 energy education conservation program (Hawaii). Missouri reports that most school districts are integrating energy education efforts into existing science and social studies programs; and twenty others reported exemplary energy education programs in certain school districts. *The Status of State Energy Education Policy*, Energy Information Associates, Inc. (Denver,

Colorado: The Education Commission of the States, forthcoming).

[32] *Ethical-Citizenship Education: Policies and Programs: A National Survey of State Education Agencies*, pp. 7, 10-11.

[33] Other priority areas are basic skills and career education. Research for Better Schools, *Progress Report*, June 1978.

[34] See Mary Jane Turner, *Who Teaches Citizenship? A Survey of Documents and Resources* (Boulder, Colorado: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977), p. 37.

[35] *Education and Citizenship*, pp. 86-88.

[36] By Ann Maust and Lucy Knight. This and the other papers may be obtained by writing to Elizabeth Farquhar, Citizen Education; U.S. Office of Education; Division of International Education; R.O.B. #3 — Room 3919; Washington, D.C. 20202.

[37] Descriptions are from a photocopied announcement of the availability of the papers, USOE Citizen Education Staff, Fall, 1978.

[38] *Citizen Education Bulletin*, Vol. I, No. 1 (August, 1977), p. 1.

[39] "Statement of Norman Gross, Press Conference on NAEP Results Regarding 'Changes in Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1967-76' February 1, 1978, Washington, D.C.," p. 3.

[40] The task force was composed of Richard C. Snyder (Mershon Center) chairman, Lee F. Anderson (Northwestern University), Rudolph de la Garza (Colorado College), Mae King (American Political Science Association), Charles Quigley (Law in a Free Society Project), Richard C. Remy, and Shelby Lewis Smith (Atlanta University). See "Criteria for Improving Political Education in Elementary School," by Lee F. Anderson, Richard C. Remy, and Richard C. Snyder, *International Journal of Political Education*, 1 (1977), 61-72. The Citizenship Development Program is one of five major programs being carried out at the Mershon Center, all related to policy-making and national security — as specified in the endowment from the estate of Colonel Ralph D. Mershon.

[41] *Skills in Citizen Action* (University of Wisconsin: Citizen Participation Curriculum Project, 1977), pp. 5-6.

[42] These materials were originally developed by the St. Louis law project and are available from West Publishing Co. The Institute for Political/Legal Education field tested the materials and provides teacher training in their use.

[43] *Building Rationales for Citizenship Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-28.

[44] *A Conceptualization of Citizen Education: Final Report* (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, September 1978), pp. 18-96.

[45] "The American Experiment: E Pluribus Unum," The Educational Development Center, School and Society Programs (Newton, Massachusetts; n.d.).

[46] Richard C. Remy, *Consumer and Citizenship Education Today: A Comparative Analysis of Key Assumptions* (The Mershon Center, March 1978).

Resources

Bibliography

Anderson, Lee F., Richard C. Remy, and Richard C. Snyder. "Criteria for Improving Political Education in Elementary School." *International Journal of Political Education*, I (September 1977), pp. 61-72.

Barr, Robert D., James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. *Defining the Social Studies*. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977. Bulletin 51.

Barth, James L. and S. Samuel Shermis. "Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions." *Social Education*, XXXIV (November 1970), pp. 743-761.

Bell, Terrel. *Morality and Citizenship Education: Whose Responsibility?* Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Winter 1976. Occasional Paper No. 1.

Blum, Mark. *Ethical-Citizenship Education Policies and Programs: A National Survey of State Education Agencies*. Phildelphia: Research for Better Schools, Spring 1977.

Broudy, Harry S. *Moral/Citizenship Education: Potentials and Limitations*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Winter 1977. Occasional Paper No. 3.

Butts, Freeman. "Education for Citizenship: The Oldest, Newest Innovation in Schools." *Center for Information on America*, XXVI (April 1977), pp. 1-6.

Chapman, Marian L. and Florence V. Davis. *Skills for Ethical Action: A Rationale*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, July 1977.

Citizen Education Staff. *Citizen Education in the Workplace*. U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Citizenship Education in Elementary Schools, Paper No. 1, Public Dialogue Papers: *Citizenship Development 1977-2000*. Columbus, Ohio: The Mershon Center, July 1976.

Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education. *Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science*. Washington, D.C.: The American Political Science Association, 1971.

Dawson, Richard E., Kenneth Prewitt, and Karen S. Dawson. *Political Socialization*, 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Energy Information Associates, Inc. The Status of State Energy Education Policy. Denver, Colorado: The Education Commission of the States, forthcoming.

Engle, Shirley. "Exploring the Meaning of the Social Studies." *Social Education*, XXXV (March 1971), pp. 280-288f.

Farquhar, Elizabeth and Karen Dawson. *Citizen Education Today: Developing Civic Competencies*. U.S. Office of Education, forthcoming.

Fenton, Edwin. *The Relationship of Citizenship Education to Values Education*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Winter 1977. Occasional Paper No. 2.

Foshay, Arthur A. and William W. Burton. "Citizenship as the Aim of the Social Studies." *Theory and Research in Social Education*, IV (December 1976), pp. 1-22.

Foy, Robert and others, eds. *A Framework for Social Science Education*. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, 1973.

Gillespie, Judith A. and John J. Patrick. *Comparing Political Experiences*. Washington, D.C.: The American Political Science Association, 1974.

Gross, Norman. "Statement of Norman Gross, Press Conference on NAEP Results Regarding 'Changes in Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1967-76' February 1, 1978, Washington, D.C." Chicago, Illinois: Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, American Bar Association, xeroxed.

Harman, Willis. *Citizen Education and the Future*. U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Heslep, Robert D. *Theoretical Approaches to Moral/Citizenship Education*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Winter 1978. Occasional Paper No. 4.

Hill, Russell A. and Joan D. Wallace. *A Conceptualization of Citizen Education: Final Report*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, September 1978.

_____. *Recommendations for Research, Development, and Dissemination for Ethical/Citizenship Education*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, November 1976.

_____. *Report on the National Conference on Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education: Philadelphia, June 1976*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, November 1976.

Hogan, Robert. *Research Considerations in Ethical Education*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Winter 1978. Occasional Paper No. 5.

Kuhmerker, Lisa. *Developments in Kohlberg's Theory and Scoring of Moral Dilemmas*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Winter 1978. Occasional Paper No. 6.

Kurfman, Dana G., ed. *Developing Decision-Making Skills*. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977. 47th Yearbook.

Litt, Edgar, "Education and Political Enlightenment in America." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, CCCLXI (September 1965), pp. 32-39.

Maust, Ann and Lucy Knight. *An Analysis of the Role of the U.S. Office of Education and Other Selected Federal Agencies in Citizen Education*. U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Mullis, Ina Van Slyke. *Effects of Home and School on Learning Mathematics and Political Knowledge and Attitudes*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Colorado, 1978.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. *Education for Citizenship: A Bicentennial Survey*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, November 1976.

National Center for Voluntary Action. *Citizen*

Education Today. A draft report prepared for the Citizen Education Staff of the U.S. Office of Education, n.d.

National Council for the Social Studies. *Toward a Reconceptualization of Citizenship Education: Report of a Conference*. March 1976; Indianapolis.

Newmann, Fred M. *Education for Citizen Action: Challenge for Secondary Curriculum*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.

———, Thomas A. Bertocci, and Ruthanne M. Landsness. *Skills in Citizen Action*. Madison, Wisconsin: Citizen Participation Curriculum Project, 1977.

Patrick, John J. "Political Socialization and Political Education in Schools." *Social Education*, XXXIII (January 1976), pp. 15-21.

Phillips, Richard C. "Implications of Political Socialization Research for the Social Studies Curriculum." *The High School Journal*, LIII (November 1969), pp. 99-111.

Piaget, Jean. *To Understand is to Invent: The Future of Education*. New York: Grossman, 1972.

Pipho, Chris. "State Activity: Minimal Competency Testing." Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, October 5, 1978. Photocopied.

Remy, Richard C. *Consumer and Citizenship Education Today: A Comparative Analysis of Key Assumptions*. Columbus, Ohio: The Mershon Center, March 1978.

——— and Lee Anderson. "Political Education in Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science." *Political Science*, IV (Summer 1971), pp. 431-459.

Renshon, Stanley Allen, ed. *Handbook of Political Socialization*. New York: Free Press, 1977.

The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education. *Education for Responsible Citizenship*. (Cosponsored by the Danforth Foundation and the Charles F. Kettering Foundation.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Robinson, Donald W. ed. *Readings in Citizen Education: A National Conference on "Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good."* September 1976; Kansas City, Missouri: U.S. Office of Education, n.d.

Rothstein, Larry. *New Directions in Communications Policy: Implications for Citizen Education and Participation*. U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Salisbury, Robert. *Key Concepts of Citizenship: Perspectives and Dilemmas*. U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Sallada, Logan H. "Key Issues and Problems in Developing New National Policy for Civic Education." Paper presented at the National Conference on Citizen Education: Kansas City, Missouri; September 20-23, 1976.

Sanders, Norris M. and Marlin L. Tarick. "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects." *Social Education*, XXXIV (April 1970), pp. 383-446.

School and Society Programs. "The American Experiment: E Pluribus, Unum." Newton, Massachusetts: The Educational Development Center. Photocopied.

Shaver, James P. "Social Studies: The Need for Redefinition." *Social Education*, XXXI (November 1967), pp. 588-593.

———, ed. *Building Rationales for Citizenship Education*. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977. Bulletin 52.

Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship. *Directory of Law-Related Education Projects*. Chicago: American Bar Association, 1978.

———. *Education Law and Education Innovation: How State Laws and Regulations on Teaching and Learning Have Affected Law-Related Education*. A paper submitted to the Ford Foundation in July 1978.

———. *Teaching Teachers About Law: A Guide to Law-Related Teacher Education Programs*. Chicago: American Bar Association, 1976.

Superka, Douglas P. and others. *Values Education Sourcebook*: Conceptual Approaches, Materials Analyses, and an Annotated Bibliography. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium and ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 1976.

Toner, Nea and Walter Toner. *Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency for Public Policy*. U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Turner, Mary Jane. *Who Teaches Citizenship? A Survey of Documents and Resources*. Boulder, Colorado: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977.

———. *Political Education in the United States: History, Status, Critical Analysis, and an Alternative Model*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Colorado, 1978.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Education and Citizenship: A Conference Report*. Denver, Colorado: Office of Education, 1976.

Weiner, Karl J. "Citizenship Education." *Clearing House*, (February 1969), pp. 355-357.

Zeigler, Harmon and Wayne Peak. "The Functions of the Educational System." *Sociology of Education*, XLIII (Spring 1970), pp. 115-142.

Organizations and Contact Persons

Alliance for Citizen Education
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19108
(215) 922-8960
Edward Schwartz, President

American Polical Science Association
1527 New Hampshire, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 483-2512
Evron Kirkpatrick, Executive Director

Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 271-4727
Gary Emanuel, Social Studies Specialist

Bureau of Research Services
Utah State University
UNC 28
Logan, UT 84321
(801) 752-4100
James P. Shaver, Chairman

Carnegie-Mellon Education Center
Porter Hall 223
Carnegie-Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 578-2935
Edwin Fenton, Director

Center for Policy Research
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027
(212) 870-2180
Amitai Etzioni, Director

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions
Box 4068
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
(805) 969-3281
Maurice Mitchell, President

Center for the Study of Social Policy
SRI International
333 Ravenswood
Palo Alto, CA 94025
(415) 326-6200
Tom Thomas, Director
Willis Harman, Associate Director

Center on Economics and Social Studies Education
George Peobody College for Teachers
Box 324
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 327-8350
Ronald Galbraith, Director

Chamber of Commerce of the United States
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20062
(202) 659-6157
John Sullivan, Public Affairs Director

Citizen Participation Curriculum Project
University of Wisconsin
225 North Mills Street
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 263-6262
Fred M. Newmann, Director

Citizenship Development Program
The Mershon Center
Ohio State University
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201
(614) 422-1681
Richard C. Remy, Director

Close-Up
Suite 316
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 342-8700
Stephen Janger, President

Colorado Council on Economic Education
1390 Logan Street, Suite 312
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 832-5254
LaKay Schmitt, Executive Director

Common Cause
2030 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-1200
Nan Waterman, Chairperson

Constitutional Rights Foundation
8310 San Vicente Blvd., Suite 402
Los Angeles, CA 90048
(213) 930-1510
Vivian Monroe, Executive Director
Todd Clark, Education Director

Council of Chief State School Officers
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-4194
Byron Hansford, Executive Director

The Danforth Foundation
222 South Central Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 862-6200
Geraldine Bagby, Vice-President

ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education
855 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 492-8434
Irving Morrissett, Director

Ford Foundation
320 E. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017
(212) 573-5000
Howard R. Dressner, Secretary

Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.
218 East 18th Street
New York, NY 10003
(212) 475-0850
Andy Smith or Larry Condon

The Hazen Foundation
400 Prospect Street
New Haven, CN 06511
(203) 865-4121
Anne L. Hoblitzelle, Assistant Director

William Randolph Hearst Foundation
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019
(212) 586-5404
Robert M. Frehse, Director of Administration

/I/D/E/A/
P.O. Box 446
Melbourne, FL 32901
(305) 723-0211
B. Frank Brown, Director of Information and Services

Illinois Office of Education
100 N. First Street
Springfield, IL 62777

(217) 782-2826
Ann Pictor, Social Studies Consultant

Department of Psychology
University of Illinois (Circle Campus)
Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680
(312) 996-3031
Judith Torney, Professor of Psychology

Indiana Department of Public Instruction
229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 927-0111
Jane Lowrie, Social Studies Consultant

Institute for Poltical/Legal Education
207 Delsea Drive
RD #4, Box 209
Sewell, NJ 08080
(609) 228-6000
Myron Judy, Program Administrator

Institute for Responsive Education
704 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
(617) 353-3309
Don Davies, President

Institute for the Study of Civic Values
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19108
(215) 922-8960
Edward Schwartz, Director

Robert F. Kennedy Memorial
1035 30th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 338-7444
David Hackett, Executive Director

The Charles F. Kettering Foundation and /I/D/E/A/
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, OH 45429
(513) 434-7300
Samuel G. Sava, Director

Law in Action National Office
393 North Euclid Avenue, Rm 25
St. Louis, MO 63108
(314) 361-8626
Trudy Faust, Coordinator

Law in a Free Society
606 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 600
Santa Monica, CA 90401
(213) 393-0523
Charles Quigley, Executive Director

Lilly Endowment, Inc.
2801 N. Meridian Street
Indianapolis, IN 46208
(317) 924-5471
Landrum R. Bolling, President

Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, MA 02155
(617) 628-5000
Franics Duehay, Director

Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education
Social Studies Development Center
Indiana University
513 North Park Avenue
Bloomington, IN 47401
(812) 337-3838
James Becker, Director

Missouri State Department of Education
Hammond Building
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65101
(314) 751-2625
Warren Soloman, Director
Curriculum Disseminatior

Mott Foundation
500 Mott Foundation Build.ng
Flint, MI 48502
(313) 239-9441
William F. Grenishaw, Director
of Information

Ralph Nadar's Public Citizen, Inc.
P.O. Box 19404
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-9142
Susan Weber, Director

National Assessment of Educational Progress
The Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, CO 80295
Roy Forbes, Director
Dick Hulsart, Development Coordinator

National Committee for Citizens in Education
Suite 410
Wilde Lake Village Green
Columbia, MD 21044
(301) 997-9300
Carl Marburger, Senior Associate

National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc.
36 West 44th Street
New York, NY 10036
(212) 840-2844
Mary Kohler, Director

National Council for the Social Studies
2030 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-0760
Elizabeth Scott, Coordinator
Development and Field Services

National Endowment for the Humanities
806 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
(202) 724-0373
William Russell, Director
Elementary/Secondary Department

National Street Law Institute
605 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 624-8217
Jason Newman, Director
Edward O'Brien, Deputy Director

National Student Volunteer Program
800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20525
(202) 254-8370
Jeanne Carney, Director

Department of Political Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60201
(312) 492-7026
Lee Anderson, Professor of Political Science

Research for Better Schools
Suite 1700, 1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 561-4100
Russell A. Hill, Director
Planning for Moral Citizenship Education
Barbara Presseisen, Director
Citizen Education Component, Development Division

Russell Sage Foundation
230 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017
(212) 949-8990
Herbert McCloskey, Program Director
Citizenship

School and Society Programs
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02160
(617) 969-7100
Janet Whitla, Director

The Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 492-8434
Irving Morrissett, Director
Mary Jane Turner, Staff Associate

Social Studies Development Center
513 N. Park
Bloomington, IN 47401
(812) 337-3838
Howard Mehlinger, Director
Judy Gillespie, Director
Energy Education Cirriculum Project and Coalition for Early Adolescence
John Patrick, Professor of Education

Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship
American Bar Association
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
(312) 947-3960
Norman Gross, Staff Director
Charlotte Anderson, Assistant Staff Director
Charles White, Assistant Staff Director

Robert A. Taft Institute of Government
420 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
(212) 682-1530
Marilyn Chelstrom, President

Trade-Offs
Joint Council on Economic Education
1212 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 582-5150
Michael MacDowell, President

UCLA Center for Economic Education
Department of Education
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024
(213) 825-8383
Marilyn Kourilsky, Director

U.S. Office of Education
Donahue Building
600 Fourth Street
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 472-2653
Elizabeth Farquhar, Director
Citizen Education
(See footnote 36)

World Future Society
4916 St. Elmo Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20014
(202) 656-8274
Sally Cornish, Program Director
Chris Dede, President
Education Section

Education Commission of the States

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-six states, American Samoa, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among governors, state legislators and educators for the improvement of education. This report is an outcome of one of many commission undertakings at all levels of education. The commission offices are located at Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295.

It is the policy of the Education Commission of the States to take affirmative action to prevent discrimination in its policies, programs and employment practices.